

who have dependents to support; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 9287) to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WISE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 231) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment, and the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, the appropriation for the Georgia Experiment Station of the State of Georgia under act of March 4, 1917, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, to the board of trustees of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBBINS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 232) suspending penalty in Government contracts when compliance was prevented by Fuel Administrator suspending operation of plants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 9288) granting a pension to Oscar Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9289) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Moser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9290) granting an increase of pension to Charles Fish; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 9291) granting a pension to Frank W. Tuttle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: A bill (H. R. 9292) granting an increase of pension to George D. Totman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9293) granting an increase of pension to James O. Harriman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 9294) for the relief of the heirs of John Kensler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9295) for the relief of Francis M. Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARLAND: A bill (H. R. 9296) for the relief of David Steers, alias William Johnson, alias John Hartman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 9297) granting an increase of pension to Hezekiah Bradd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 9298) granting a pension to Kate C. Kraig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9299) for the relief of Henry H. Staub; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 9300) granting an increase of pension to John Stockwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9301) granting a pension to Nancy E. Tennant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 9302) granting an increase of pension to James Reppeto; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 9303) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Crites; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 9304) granting a pension to Ambrose M. Barrett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 9305) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 9306) granting an increase of pension to John Ham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9307) granting an increase of pension to Jasper N. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9308) granting an increase of pension to John W. McKinley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9309) granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Cline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9310) granting an increase of pension to Jonas Bratton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 233) for the relief of James L. Cardwell; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolution of the City Council of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the discontinuance of the

pneumatic-tube mail service in that city; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Division No. 3 of the Railway Employees, pledging loyalty and support to the administration; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania: Petition of John W. Haskins, H. D. Pratt, William J. Cunningham, J. Greenwalt, and 18 others, of Pennsylvania, relative to the preservation of the Niagara used in the Battle of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of patrons of mail route No. 1, Rural Free Delivery, Orangeville, Sacramento County, Cal., praying that rural carriers be given an increase in salary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of John S. Sills & Sons, of New York, against repeal of advance in second-class mailing rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: Petition of Francis M. Roberts, of Malden, Mass., relative to compensation for land grant canceled by the Government; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of John A. Hynes and others, favoring the volunteer officers' retirement bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MERRITT: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Stamford, Conn., favoring passage of a bill providing for a war council; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAIGE: Papers to accompany House bill 9275, granting a pension to Edwin S. Goodell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of home defense committee of Utica, N. Y., relative to conserving and putting to public use the water power of the country; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TAGUE: Memorial of Westchester County (N. Y.) commission, favoring the daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### SENATE.

MONDAY, January 28, 1918.

Rev. G. I. Humphreys, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and most merciful God, Father of all our mercies, Giver of every good and spiritual gift, the Author of everlasting life, we bow in acknowledgment of Thy sovereignty over us and confess Thy right to us and ours. We thank Thee, our heavenly Father, for Thy blessings, seen and unseen, for the wonders of Thy kindnesses, for the marvels of Thy patience, and for the infinite tenderness of Thy love that moves and wins and ties our hearts unto Thee and unto Thy ways.

We pray Thy favor, our heavenly Father, upon this day's session of the Senate. Bless, we beseech Thee, the presiding officer, the Members, and the officials thereof; and we humbly pray Thee to look with favor upon this our beloved land in these days of stress and strain, of tension and of testing.

Bless, we pray Thee, our heavenly Father, the President of the United States and those associated with him in authority, and grant, we beseech Thee, to let Thy blessing rest upon all the citizens of our land. Give unto each and every one of us, we humbly ask Thee, the intense desire of heart, the purpose of mind and of will that we may prove ourselves worthy. O God of Hosts, in Thy sight, worthy for victory on land and on sea, that we may insure for ourselves and for the generations that are yet to come the principles of liberty, and of justice, and of mercy, and of righteousness.

Bless, we pray Thee, all the peoples and mankind, and grant, we pray Thee, that more and more the hearts of men everywhere may turn to Thee as our Father, to Jesus Christ as our Savior and the Leader of mankind; and unto this end we humbly ask Thee for the Holy Spirit, His presence and His power, that He may guide us through to-day and to-morrow and all the to-morrows of life into the way that leadeth unto the perfect day. We ask in Christ's name. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on request of Mr. JAMES and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GRONNA. I send to the Secretary's desk a letter from the Tri-State Grain and Stock Growers' Convention and a resolution adopted by that convention favoring woman suffrage. I ask that they may be printed in the Record without reading.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRI-STATE GRAIN AND STOCK GROWERS' CONVENTION,  
Pargo, N. Dak., January 22, 1918.

Senator A. J. GRONNA,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am sending for your consideration a resolution passed by the Tri-State Grain and Stock Growers' Convention at their recent meeting on January 18.

This resolution met with the unanimous approval of the convention, and, as the body was a large and representative one, we respectfully ask that you give it your indorsement.

Very truly, yours,

W. C. PALMER.

Be it resolved, That, recognizing in this great crisis as never before the important service women have rendered the Government, we earnestly request and recommend the passage of the Federal amendment for woman suffrage.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have a resolution here from Meridian Grange, No. 265, of Kent, Wash., petitioning Congress to pass a law making it treasonable to purchase or offer to purchase, contract, or bargain for securities of the United States below par. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Judiciary Committee, I suppose.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERIDIAN GRANGE, No. 265,  
KENT, WASH.

#### Resolution.

Whereas an attack on the Nation's credit is, in our opinion, equal to an attack on any of our other defenses; and  
Whereas such an attack is apparently being made on our liberty bonds, now quoted in financial circles below par: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we request all liberty-loving organizations to join with us in petitioning Congress to enact legislation making it a treasonable offense—punishable as such—for any person, company, corporation, firm, or any association of persons of any nature whatsoever, to purchase, offer to purchase, contract for, or bargain for, in any way any class of United States bonds, securities, or moneys at a price below the face value thereof anywhere within the boundaries of the said United States or her Territories.

Adopted by the patrons of Meridian Grange, No. 265, in regular meeting assembled, January 5, 1918, and a copy ordered mailed President Wilson, our Senators, and Congressmen.

PETER T. NELSON,  
Master.  
C. R. COTTRELL,  
Secretary.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I send to the Secretary's desk a telegram which I ask may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

DENVER, COLO., January 21, 1918.

Hon. JOHN F. SHAFROTH,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

If there is in the minds of any Senators a doubt as to the feeling in Colorado on woman suffrage, we urge that you inform them that the people of Colorado, after 24 years' experience, are more strongly in favor of it than ever before. We ask that you have this telegram read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

WILLIAM A. HILL,  
JAMES H. TELLER,  
S. H. WHITE,  
TULLY SCOTT,  
JAMES E. GARRIGUES,  
MORTON S. BAILEY,  
GEORGE W. ALLEN.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I wish to say with relation to this telegram that the senders are the members of the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and they have lived in that State during the full period of the operation of the woman suffrage law. In addition, I wish to say in support of their statement that there never has been even a bill introduced in the general assembly of that State for the resubmission of the question of woman suffrage; that there never has been even a petition presented to either the senate or the house of representatives of that State to resubmit the question. These are the best indications that the people of Colorado are thoroughly satisfied with the operation and effect of equal suffrage.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, we are seeking to relieve a number of industries in which coal is not used from the unfortunate constructions that have been placed upon the order of Dr. Garfield. In this connection, out of many letters and telegrams I have received pointing out instances where the order is operating not to save coal but to interfere uselessly and, I think, unwisely with industries, I send three short telegrams to the desk and ask that they may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

COLUMBUS, GA., January 26, 1918.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Local mills on Government contracts operated by hydroelectricity ordered to close Monday by local fuel board.

H. H. SWIFT.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, in connection with the telegram just read I desire to state that there are nearly a dozen of those mills operating at Columbus, Ga., employing over 7,000 hands, and that they have largely been engaged in Government contracts, among others, contracts for the manufacture of blankets, and blankets are still needed in our camps.

The Secretary read the remaining telegrams, as follows:

SAVANNAH, GA., January 27, 1918.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Could you not prevail on Fuel Administrator to modify orders for fuelless Mondays, so that business houses may remain open, not using fuel. On account of climatic advantages in the South, on many of these fuelless days no heat is required and business could go on as usual. As it is business is suspended and nothing is gained, while there is serious loss of money to all classes and no saving of fuel. Of course, where fuel would be needed and temperatures are low stores would not open.

MORNING NEWS.

ABBEVILLE, GA., January 24, 1918.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,  
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you to know if you think that Dr. Garfield's order applies to a small merchant in a small town who is burning small lightwood knots. Abbeville has not been able to get any coal this winter. We are just as loyal as we can be and believe strong in the President and are willing to do anything that will help to win the war.

It could not possibly help anything for the sawmills in Georgia to shut down, as none of them burn coal. We want to win the war, but we do not want any red tape or foolishness about it.

With best regards, I am,

Yours, very truly,

L. C. GOODIN.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution adopted at a meeting of merchants in one of the largest cotton-mill centers in the United States, and I ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

GASTONIA, N. C., January 21, 1918.

Hon. LEE S. OVERMAN,  
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. OVERMAN: In order that you may let it be known whenever there is opportunity that there is nothing lacking in North Carolina's patriotism I am writing to tell you that the following resolution was adopted by the textile millmen of Gaston County at a meeting held Saturday:

"We have read the order of the National Fuel Administrator, Dr. Garfield, and have secured all information thereon that it has been possible to secure, and while we, individually and collectively, think that the legal and moral right exists under which factories using as motive power hydroelectric current may continue to operate under said order, nevertheless, out of the abundance of our willingness to cooperate to the fullest with the spirit of said order, we frankly and freely pledge ourselves to complete compliance with said order to the effect that we, the mills of Gaston County, remain closed throughout Monday, January 21, and Tuesday, January 22, and during each of the following Mondays—that is, from Monday, January 28, to and including Monday, March 25.

"(Signed) R. R. RAY, Chairman.  
"J. H. SEPAK, Secretary."

At a meeting of Gastonia merchants, held Saturday morning, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas it is the sense of this meeting that the Fuel Administration's order means that grocery stores shall close at noon and that all other stores shall absolutely close their doors for the entire day each Monday for the next 10 weeks: Be it

Resolved, That the merchants of Gastonia pledge their cooperation and support to the government of the ruling and pledge themselves to strictly abide by it to the letter."

Many of our mills will pay their employees for their lost time.

Very truly, yours,

GASTONIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
FRED M. ALLEN, Executive Secretary.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I desire to present to the Senate for appropriate reference a number of telegrams relating to short-line railroads in the United States. I ask that the first telegram be read to the Senate for its information, and that it and the remainder of them be referred without reading to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, but that all be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The first telegram was read; and all were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOULTRIE, GA., January 25, 1918.

Senator T. W. HARDWICK,  
Washington, D. C.:

Board of directors Moultrie Chamber of Commerce last night passed resolution in protest of proposed policy by Director General McAdoo with reference to short-line railroads. Copy of this resolution going forward to Georgia Senators and Representatives to-day.

CHAS. B. CALDWELL,  
Secretary Chamber of Commerce.



MOULTRIE, GA., January 25, 1918.

Hon. T. W. HARDWICK,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Majority of food crops of nation are produced in communities dependent upon short lines for transportation. Unless short lines are given same Government protection as trunk lines, food crops will necessarily be reduced. We urge your support of Government operation of short lines in behalf of food supply of Nation.

W. J. MATTHEWS,  
President Moultrie Mill & Elevator Co.  
G. F. TAYLOR,  
President Moultrie Oil & Fertilizer Co.

MOULTRIE, GA., January 26, 1918.

Hon. T. W. HARDWICK,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Of the four lines entering Moultrie, at least two of them will cease to operate within six months and territory served by them will suffer seriously unless Government operates them. I urge you to use all your influence to have all short lines taken over.

J. H. HALL.

MOULTRIE, GA., January 25, 1918.

Hon. T. W. HARDWICK,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We are greatly alarmed over the project pending in the House and Senate committees concerning the attitude of Director General of Railroads regarding short lines. This community is wholly served by short lines, and a discontinuance of their successful operation would be disastrous to the farming interests of our county. We urge your influence be used accordingly.

G. W. NEWTON,  
President Colquitt County Live Stock Association.

MOULTRIE, GA., January 25, 1918.

Hon. T. W. HARDWICK,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Many of our mills are served by short-line railroads, and unless these lines are taken over on same basis as trunk lines a great number of mills will suffer. We think it only fair that territory adjacent to and served by short lines should be maintained on same basis as that served by trunk lines, and short-line territory not discriminated against. We urge you to use your influence to have the proper legislation passed.

COTTON MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION OF GEORGIA,  
W. J. VEREEN, Chairman.

MOULTRIE, GA., January 25, 1918.

Hon. T. W. HARDWICK,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We heartily indorse and urge your support in behalf of Government operation of short lines as outlined in telegram of this date from our chamber of commerce to you. This not only applies to our section but to all sections of the Union served wholly or in part by short lines.

M. L. LEE.	I. A. HEARD.
H. I. ASHBURN.	J. J. ROONEY.
J. BENSON.	C. L. STEVENSON.
A. R. ROGERS.	M. N. MAJORS.
C. G. WATSON.	S. P. TURNBULL.
C. B. ALLEN.	

MOULTRIE, GA., January 25, 1918.

Hon. T. W. HARDWICK,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Sawmills located on short lines of the Nation can not continue cutting lumber if operation of short lines is handicapped by Government's failure to give them equal protection with trunk lines. We urge your influence be used to have short lines operated by Government.

JOHNSON BATTLE LUMBER CO.  
LADSON LUMBER CO.  
CORBETT LUMBER CO.

MOULTRIE, GA., January 25, 1918.

Hon. T. W. HARDWICK,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The short lines have been the developers and are now important lines on which a large portion of food crops are originated, and any discrimination against their operation will greatly reduce average planted to food crops, and the result will prove serious. I urge you to support legislation to have them operated on same basis as trunk lines.

V. L. COLLIER,  
County Agent in Agriculture.

MOULTRIE, GA., January 25, 1918.

Hon. T. W. HARDWICK,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The welfare of our city and community is seriously menaced by the announcement of Director General of Railroads that short lines will not be taken over. I urge that you use your influence to have the short lines included and operated the same as the trunk lines, in order that serious embarrassment to this town and county, which was developed by and is now wholly dependent upon short lines, may be avoided.

W. A. COVINGTON,  
Mayor City of Moultrie.

MOULTRIE, GA., January 25, 1918.

Hon. T. W. HARDWICK,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The announcement of Director General of Railroads probability of not taking over short lines is halting plans of our farmers planting food crops for fear of transportation facilities being hampered on account of this section being entirely served by short lines. The situation is serious. We request and urge that you do all in your power to have the short lines put under the same control that trunk or through lines are.

MOULTRIE BANKING CO.,  
By W. C. VEREEN, President Citizens' Bank.  
W. S. STOKES, Cashier First National Bank.  
C. L. WEST, Cashier.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I send to the desk a copy of a resolution and memorial of the Farmers' Equity Union of the United States, adopted at a meeting of the union held at Aberdeen, S. Dak., on January 6. I ask that the resolution and memorial may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution and memorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Resolution and memorial, Farmers' Equity Union.]

Whereas the successful prosecution of the war is to an important extent dependent upon the American farmer for the increased production of food required, and the supply of farmers and farm laborers has been greatly diminished by enlistment under the colors, thereby still further increasing the burden which the American farmer has cheerfully assumed; and

Whereas in the intensive and increased cultivation being and about to be undertaken the farmer is and will be required to incur an unprecedented increase in both expense and labor, thereby rendering necessary a more extensive and flexible system of temporary farm credits; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has necessarily assumed the control of the railways and many great industries of the Nation and has justly undertaken to guarantee to the owners the payment of prewar dividends; and

Whereas all such industries from their nature will invariably earn dividends at least approximating those guaranteed, while owing to the almost inevitable crop failures in some sections of the country the production of crops is an uncertainty, despite all efforts of man; and

Whereas it is but just and equitable that the farmers of the Nation should have some assurance or guaranty from the Government that they will be enabled to secure at least the actual expenses necessarily attendant upon their present and future efforts to maintain and increase the production of crops in the event of a failure of crops in some or all sections of the country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions and appended memorial be presented to the President and to the Congress of the United States assembled.

[Memorial.]

TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

The Farmers' Equity Union of the United States, as representative of all branches of the farming industry in America, and with conscious pride in the manner in which the American farmers have discharged and are discharging their patriotic duty in maintaining and increasing the production of foodstuffs under the existing circumstances, would respectfully present the following memorial.

It is undebatable that the present emergency has greatly increased the burden of the American farmer. By voluntary enlistment and the operation of the selective-service law great numbers of farmers and farm laborers have been withdrawn from the fields and more will eventually be called. Necessity demands an enormously increased production. New lands must be broken and every acre previously cultivated must be farmed, and the whole farmed most intensively. The conversion of implement factories to the military needs has made new farm machinery scarce in many places and exceedingly expensive everywhere. To farm the increased acreage intensively, with experienced farm laborers both scarce and high priced, makes the use of farm machinery imperative and to an extent hitherto unnecessary.

In magnitude and importance farming as an industry is second to none in the land. From the nature of things farming can not be undertaken by the Government. Transportation and many great industries have already been taken over by the Government, with the sole view of increasing production. In justice to the owners the Government has guaranteed these industries not only operating expenses but maintenance and prewar dividends. The farmers are asked to and must increase their own production. Toward this end the farmers must and are willing to work longer hours, but they must also pay extraordinary wages and purchase machinery at prices to an extent justified only by the present emergency.

It is not in the power of the Government to guarantee them a crop. The present minimum price for grain was fixed after the 1917 crop had been produced. The possibility of crop failure had been eliminated. These prices are not such that the farmer should be asked to invest either increased labor, laborers' wages, and overhead expenses, which are justified only by the emergency, and at the same time carry the entire risk of crop failure.

We respectfully submit that the Government should take immediate steps to remedy the situation, and would suggest that there be considered as possible remedies:

1. The immediate fixing of a definite minimum price for 1918 crops at a sufficient increase over present prices to justify the farmers in assuming the risk of crop failure; or

2. That the Government guarantee the payment of actual farm expenses and an allowance for emergency investment in increased machinery in event of and to the extent of a crop failure wherever the same may develop.

In any event, we pledge ourselves to support the Government and perform our duty to the utmost.

II.

Whereas the United States Government has taken over and now has control of the operation of the railways of the United States for the duration of the present emergency; and

Whereas we believe such action to be to the advantage of the Nation and the producers therein, from both a military and economic standpoint: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we do heartily commend and approve the action of the President in taking over the operation of the railways; and be it further

Resolved, That we do hereby urge and recommend to the President and the Congress of the United States that the Federal Government permanently assume the actual ownership and operation of the railways of the Nation for all time to come, after the termination of the existing emergency; and be it further

Resolved, That we do hereby urge and recommend to the President and the Congress of the United States that the Federal Government, upon the termination of the present emergency, assume the ownership and operation of all public utilities whatsoever.



## III.

Whereas the drain upon the capital of the Nation by the necessary expenses of the present war has brought about a financial stringency, which has, to a considerable extent, impeded and hindered the operation of the Federal farm-loan associations by the limiting of the market for the sale of farm securities; and

Whereas the successful operation of the farm industries of the Nation necessitate that the farmers be enabled to borrow necessary capital at a reasonable rate of interest, afforded only through the Federal farm-loan associations; and

Whereas there is now before Congress a bill to appropriate \$200,000,000 for the stabilizing of the market for such securities by the purchase thereof by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we do hereby recommend and approve such measure, and do hereby petition and urge the Congress and the President of the United States to exert all efforts to the immediate passage and approval of such measures as will assist in the furthering of the flexible continuation and extension of the Federal farm-loan associations by the purchasing of such securities, where necessary, by the Federal Government.

## IV.

Whereas the successful promotion of the war is to a large extent dependent upon the increased production of foodstuffs by American farmers; and

Whereas in many sections of the Northwest there were total or partial failures of crops for the season of 1917; and

Whereas the extensive purchase of Liberty bonds throughout the Northwest and the Nation has withdrawn much money from circulation which has heretofore been available to the farmers to tide them over similar crop failures in the past; and

Whereas Congressman J. N. BAER, of North Dakota, has introduced in the House of Representatives a bill to render Federal aid to the farmers of the Northwest in purchasing seed and feed to enable them to continue and increase the production of foodstuffs and thereby support the Government and our armies: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we recommend and approve such measure and do urge and petition the Congress and the President that such measure be passed and approved without delay.

## V.

Whereas the Missouri River contains unlimited possibilities for the development of hydroelectric power, navigation, and water power, and at the same time prevent the annual devastation from floods: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we approve and favor a survey to determine the feasibility of the development of the Missouri River, and in the event such development appears feasible the development thereof by joint action of the Federal Government and the several States through which the Missouri River passes.

Respectfully submitted,

H. A. MELGAARD,  
J. S. JOHNSON,  
H. O. KJAR,  
C. C. TALBOTT,  
F. B. DEWEY.

Committee on Resolutions.

Mr. CUMMINS. I present a resolution in favor of the proposed constitutional amendment for woman suffrage. I ask that it be printed in the Record without reading.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HON. ALBERT CUMMINS,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas the next step toward securing the passage of the Susan B. Anthony amendment enfranchising women will be a favorable majority vote in the Senate: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we, the women of Des Moines, Iowa, assembled at Hotel Chamberlain, January 17, 1918, urge you to use your influence with friends and members of your party to the effect of securing a favorable vote in the upper House of Congress.

Senator CUMMINS, you have been very helpful. We thank you and count on your active support, and I ask to have this resolution read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

GERTRUDE HURFORD MILNER,  
Chairman Seventh Congressional District,  
Iowa Branch National Woman's Party.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Modesto, Cal., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. HARDING presented a petition of sundry citizens of Mount Vernon, Ohio, praying for an increase of the salaries and equipment allowance of rural mail carriers, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Amoskeag Textile Club, of Manchester, N. H., praying for the passage of the so-called "daylight-saving" bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Denis Ryan, of Farmington, N. H., praying for an increase in the pensions of veterans of the Civil War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of H. W. Lippincott, of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the importation of Chinese farmers into this country during the war, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MCLEAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wallingford, Conn., praying for the repair, preservation, care,

and future maintenance of the restored historical naval brig *Niagara*, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Sharon, Conn., praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. THOMPSON presented petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg; Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City; of sundry citizens of Sumner County; of the United Trades and Labor Council and Labor Temple, of Pittsburg; of sundry citizens of Ottawa County; and of the Chamber of Commerce of Topeka, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide increased compensation to postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Cooperative Club of Topeka, Kans., remonstrating against the repeal of present postage-rate legislation, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pratt, Geary, Logan, Morris, Miami, Sheridan, Englewood, Clark, Trego, Hodgeman, Sherman, Hamilton, Barber, Meade, Brown, Republic, Chase, Kiowa, Decatur, Doniphan, Graham, Coffey, Lyon, Johnson, Osage, and various other counties, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the creation of a pharmaceutical corps in the Army, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of the Commercial Club of Hutchinson, the Rotary Club of Hutchinson, and the Rotary Club of Topeka, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for universal military training, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT—SHIELDS BILL.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, the United States Senate, during the present session—December 14, 1917—passed a bill providing for the improvement of navigation and developing water power in the navigable rivers of the United States with private capital—Senate bill No. 1419, commonly called the Shields bill—by a vote of 46 to 18, as follows:

## YEAS—46.

Bankhead	Kendrick	Overman	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Knox	Page	Smith, Ga.
Calder	Lewis	Phelan	Smith, Md.
Coit	Lodge	Pittman	Smoot
Dillingham	McCumber	Pomerene	Stone
Fernald	McKellar	Ransdell	Thompson
Fletcher	McLean	Robinson	Underwood
Frelinghuysen	McNary	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Gallinger	Martin	Shafroth	Wadsworth
Hale	Myers	Sheppard	Weeks
Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Shields	
Jones, Wash.	New	Simmons	

## NAYS—18.

Ashurst	Hitchcock	La Follette	Sutherland
Borah	Hollis	Norris	Townsend
France	James	Poindexter	Trammell
Gore	Johnson, Cal.	Sherman	
Gronna	King	Smith, Mich.	

The provisions of this bill are substantially the same as Senate bill No. 3331, which passed the Senate at the last session of the Congress by a vote of 46 to 22, as follows:

## YEAS—46.

Bankhead	Fall	Oliver	Smith, Mich.
Beckham	Gallinger	Overman	Smoot
Brandegge	Harding	Page	Sterling
Broussard	Hardwick	Pittman	Stone
Catron	Johnson, Mo.	Pomerene	Swanson
Clapp	Jones	Ransdell	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Kern	Robinson	Vardaman
Clarke, Ark.	McLean	Shafroth	Wadsworth
Coit	Martin, Va.	Shields	Walsh
Culberson	Myers	Simmons	Williams
Curtis	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	
du Pont	O'Gorman	Smith, Ga.	

## NAYS—22.

Ashurst	Hollis	Lea, Tenn.	Poindexter
Borah	Husting	Lee, Md.	Reed
Chamberlain	James	Lewis	Sheppard
Chilton	Kenyon	Martine, N. J.	Works
Cummins	La Follette	Newlands	
Gronna	Lane	Norris	

While the newspapers of the United States have not been unanimous in their comments upon this bill, the majority of those whose utterances have come to my knowledge have approved it. These editorials approving the bills passed by the Senate demonstrate the demand of the people of the United States that the present laws upon our statute books, which have prohibited water-power development for more than 15 years, should be repealed and proper legislation enacted that will allow this great natural resource to be speedily developed and utilized.



They are able expositions of the subject of water-power development and the necessity of the same, and I believe that a collation of them will be of use to the Congress while considering this legislation. The editorials I have are from newspapers published in all parts of the United States, as follows:

Knoxville Sentinel, Knoxville, Tenn.  
Journal and Tribune, Knoxville, Tenn.  
Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn.  
The Merchant and Manufacturer, Nashville, Tenn.  
Commercial-Appeal, Memphis, Tenn.  
News-Schmitt, Memphis, Tenn.  
Memphis Business Men's Club, Memphis, Tenn.  
Chattanooga News, Chattanooga, Tenn.  
Chattanooga Times, Chattanooga, Tenn.  
McMinnville Standard, McMinnville, Tenn.  
Morristown Journal, Morristown, Tenn.  
News-Banner, Murfreesboro, Tenn.  
Jackson Sun, Jackson, Tenn.  
Johnson City Staff, Johnson City, Tenn.  
Daily Eagle, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
State-Register, Springfield, Ill.  
Post-Express, Rochester, N. Y.  
Post-Intelligencer, Seattle, Wash.  
Union-Advertiser, Rochester, N. Y.  
News-Tribune, Detroit, Mich.  
Chicago News, Chicago, Ill.  
Leslie's Weekly, New York, N. Y.  
Daily Record, Wausau, Wis.  
Washington Post, Washington, D. C.  
Evening Post, New York, N. Y.  
Electrical World, New York, N. Y.  
Scranton Republican, Scranton, Pa.  
Editor and Publisher, New York, N. Y.  
Anaconda Standard, Anaconda, Mont.  
Electrical Review, Chicago, Ill.  
Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta, Ga.  
Manufacturers' Record, Baltimore, Md.  
Pittsburgh Leader, Pittsburgh, Pa.  
Decatur Review, Decatur, Ill.  
Hannibal Post, Hannibal, Mo.  
Evansville Courier, Evansville, Ind.  
San Francisco Journal of Commerce, San Francisco, Cal.  
Kennebec Journal, Kennebec, Me.  
Springfield Union, Springfield, Mass.  
New York Journal of Commerce and Finance, New York, N. Y.  
New Bedford Mercury, New Bedford, Mass.  
Little Rock Gazette, Little Rock, Ark.  
Herald, New York, N. Y.  
St. Louis Globe-Democrat, St. Louis, Mo.  
Resolution on the development of water powers by the American Newspaper Publishers' Association.

I ask that the editorials from these papers be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, it was so ordered.

The editorials presented are as follows:

[From the Merchant and Manufacturer, Nashville, Tenn.]

#### TO UTILIZE NAVIGABLE WATERWAYS.

The Shields bill to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waterways, which passed the Senate recently, now goes to the House. Much interest had been manifested in this measure, which authorized the construction, maintenance, and operation of dams after obtaining the permit of the Secretary of War. Diversion structures and accessory works are permitted for the development and improvement of the navigation and for water power or other purposes in and along any of the navigable waters of the United States. The primary object of the bill is to allow of the development of water power. Where the power to be developed is used or to be used for a public utility the grantee must be a municipal corporation or a political subdivision or other agency of the State, a public-service agent of a State, or a public-utility corporation created and organized under the laws of a State or of the United States, authorized to furnish water, heat, or electrical energy for public or private use, and whose rates or charges and service shall be subject to regulation by the laws of the State or a duly constituted commission or other agency. Where the State has not made provision for such corporations the qualifications of the grantee thus prescribed shall not apply, and no transfer of any permit or the rights granted shall be made without the approval of the Secretary of War.

The bill requires plans and specifications of construction and maps of proposed location to be approved by the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers, and no change in such plans or specifications shall be made without the approval of these officials. The navigation facilities are required to be preserved at least equivalent to those existing prior to construction of the dam, etc., without expense to the United States, in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Secretary of War, and in case such navigation facilities are not a part of the original construction, and the United States shall deem them necessary, the grantee shall convey to the United States such land and right of way as may be required for such facilities. The grantee shall also reimburse the United States for the cost of any investigation necessary for the approval of plans and for supervision or construction, and shall pay to the United States reasonable charges in consideration of the benefits accruing and to accrue to grantees. The right to use the

public lands is granted by certification of the Secretary of War. In case of contesting applicants the permit shall be granted to the contestant judged best fitted for expediting and realizing the maximum useful development. The Secretary of War shall have, before granting the permit, the report and advice of the Chief Engineer. Control of the level above and below the dam is subject to the rules and regulations of the Secretary of War, and such lights and other signals and such fishways as may be prescribed shall be established under penalty for noncompliance.

The grantee is liable for all damages resulting from construction and operation, and when the grantee is a public-service agent of the State, a municipal corporation, or a political subdivision of the State it may acquire the right to use or damage lands or property of others necessary for construction, maintenance, and operation by the exercise of the right of eminent domain in the district courts of the United States. The permit shall continue for 50 years, and after the expiration of that time until revoked or until compensation shall be made to grantee for its property. After expiration the United States may take over all the rights hereunder granted upon paying the fair value of the property. In the determination of this value no value shall be claimed or allowed for the rights hereunder granted. All charges, rates, and service shall be subject to the laws of the State within which the service is rendered. Where any part of said power shall enter into interstate or foreign commerce, jurisdiction is conferred upon the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Any grantee failing or refusing to comply with any of the provisions of the act or any conditions under it is to be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and fined not exceeding \$1,000 for each offense, in addition to other penalties fixed by law. Work must be begun within two years after the permit is granted, and the grantee shall have in commercial operation such part of it as the Secretary of War shall determine from time to time. If any dam or other part of the work be not completed within the time fixed by the Secretary of War, or if construction shall not be begun in the appointed time, proper proceedings shall be instituted for the revocation of the grant. The Secretary of War may lease to any applicant having the capacity of grantee surplus water from any dam or structure built by the United States on such terms as deemed for the best interest of the United States and reasonable and fair to both parties, preference being given to a municipal corporation, a political division of the State or a public-service agency, provided the plans of the same are deemed by the Secretary of War adapted to conserve and utilize in the public interest the navigation and water resources of the region.

The act does not affect the rights of any person, company, or corporation as to the construction, maintenance, or operation of any structures heretofore constructed or begun under permit of the Secretary of War and Chief of Engineers or other authority lawfully granted, but any conflicting provisions concerning these must be governed by the provisions of this act. Any person, company, or corporation having the capacity of grantee now constructing or operating any structures herein specified under authority heretofore granted, may obtain from the Secretary of War upon application a permit in accordance with the provisions of this act. The act does not apply to irrigation or power dams or grants for municipal corporations affecting those approved or erected under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War of the United States.

It is specified that works constructed and maintained under this act shall not be owned, leased, controlled, or operated by any device or in any manner so that they form part of or in any way effect any combination in the form of an unlawful trust or monopoly, or any conspiracy to limit the output of electric energy, or in restraint of trade with foreign nations or between two or more States or Territories, or within any one State or Territory, in the generation, sale, or distribution of electric energy.

The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is reserved, but no grantee under this act who shall have exercised rights under it shall be deprived of any of his rights by such repeal, amendment, or alteration, all rights and the property used under it being considered the property of the grantee, until after the expiration of the 50 years.

[From the Nashville Banner, Dec. 1, 1917.]

#### HYDROELECTRIC POWER.

The scarcity of coal caused by the war demands has given impetus to the development of hydroelectric power, and it is believed the President in his coming message to Congress will recommend legislation to promote it.

It would have been well if the Shields bill, introduced two years ago for this purpose, had been passed. It was opposed by some of the ultra-conservationists of the Gifford Pinchot kind and by others for reasons of a purely political nature.

Whether or not such a measure is urged by the Executive, the present condition makes it imperative that Congress should take some action of the kind.

It will require time for the full development of the water power that may be made available for this purpose. That is why it is to be regretted that there has been unnecessary delay in this legislation. The present exigency in the coal situation has come when it might have been largely averted if the manufacture of electricity by water power had been begun some years ago, as it might have been but for the restrictions placed on the use of navigable rivers for the purpose. It was claimed by the ultra-conservationists that this valuable privilege should not be let to private enterprise, to "greedy corporations" was the phrase employed, but reserved for governmental experimentation. It was a sort of Bolshevik idea that, as usual, resulted in public injury.

It is estimated that there is now developed from coal about 30,000,000 horsepower, used in propelling machinery, by railroads, and by street car systems. Engineers have figured that it is possible to develop 65,000,000 primary horsepower from streams, and with storage reservoirs that this might be increased to 200,000,000.

There has been considerable development of hydroelectric power from rapids and cataracts in mountain streams in the far West and in other sections, including Tennessee. It is, as is well known, used to a limited extent in Nashville. But the present total horsepower from hydroelectric plants in operation throughout the country is only 6,000,000, a bare fraction of the estimated possibilities.

The European nations, where the war exigencies have been sometimes acute, have developed their water powers. A syndicate article by Norman Hapgood, now in France, recently widely published in this country, told how the fuel shortage there had led to the production of "white coal," the popular name given to water-made electric power.



Mr. Hapgood predicted that the progress made by the French under this compulsion to turn to the use of water power and electricity would more than compensate the nation for the financial losses through the war. That is a very liberal estimate, but the saving will no doubt be great, and it will be of lasting benefit to the country when its commercial and industrial life is resumed.

And France is not the only country that has made this important advance. The Germans early resorted to hydroelectric power for the manufacture of atmospheric nitrogen, the imported supply being shut off. The Italians, also, have been using it in their munition plants.

Hydroelectric power, it has been demonstrated, can be easily transmitted a distance of 250 miles, sometimes farther. The United States abounds in streams that may be utilized for its use, but legislation will be required before private capital can be employed for the purpose. The public welfare now urgently demands that such legislation be passed.

It will be proper, of course, to guard it with restrictions. There should be no perpetuity and no monopoly established by any grant or franchise for the purpose. The public right should be protected against extortion, but at the same time there should be ample encouragement for the investment of capital in that enterprise. The power will do no one any good while it remains latent. It will do immense good when fully developed. The public is suffering for the need of it now, and the Nation needs it in its preparations for war.

[From the Nashville Banner, Dec. 6, 1917.]

#### WATER-POWER BILL.

The President in his message to Congress strongly urges the enactment of a water-power bill, and what he says is in effect an indorsement of the Shields bill for that purpose that failed in the last Congress because of a disagreement in the conference committee of the House and Senate. The Shields bill had passed the Senate by a large majority, but certain changes made in the House, in which the Senate failed to concur, obstructed its enactment into a law.

It has become quite imperative that some such bill shall be passed, and in accordance with what the President urges, Senator SHIELDS, it is understood, will reintroduce his bill at an early date, or another of the same purport.

The purpose of the bill is to permit the use of rivers for the manufacture of electricity by water power. The scarcity and high price of coal render necessary the utilization of water power. Electricity manufactured by this process could supply the power for many manufacturing and traction plants that now depend exclusively on coal, and release the coal they consume for other purposes. It will not take much argument or elucidation to impress the public with the great need for the development of such enterprise at the present.

All rivers of any consequence are controlled by the United States Government and a Government franchise will have to be granted for their use. It is to regulate this granting of franchises that Congress is asked to act.

No opportunities should be given to the proverbial "greedy corporation" to obtain a "grinding monopoly" or to establish a perpetuity in anything so nearly affecting the public interest, and likely to affect it still more with the passing of time. Still, if there is to be the development of this latent power that the public interest so much demands, there must be some inducement to capital. It can be taken as assured that money will not be invested in such enterprises if there is no prospect of profit, or if the Government regulations are of such an exacting character as to allow the developers little control of the property. All that is needed is guarantee of public rights and safeguards against extortion. This was all amply provided for in the Shields bill.

Hydroelectric power is one of the greatest discoveries of the age and is expected to largely revolutionize the industry of the future. Its use just now is especially appealing, in that it can be made to save coal.

Legislation for this purpose has been regarded with some jealousy and disfavor by the coal interests, but since the point has been reached where the mines are not able to meet the demands made on them, the prospect of this manner of competition should not create alarm. With all possible development of hydroelectric power there will still be abundant use for coal.

The conservation of the coal supplies that the demands of the age are so rapidly diminishing in itself requires the fullest possible use of hydroelectric power.

[From the Nashville Banner, Dec. 17, 1917.]

#### SHIELDS POWER BILL.

The Shields water-power bill passed the Senate Saturday in practically the same form that it passed that body in the previous Congress. It failed at that time because of a disagreement on details in the House and Senate conference committee.

The bill provides, as is generally known, for use of rivers for producing electric power. This power would be a substitute for coal in factories and by traction companies and for electric lighting. A plentiful supply of such power would be worth millions to the country in the present crisis and a great boon to the people in releasing large supplies of coal now used in producing power for heating purposes.

The purposes to which this electricity, produced by water power, can be put are not yet fully developed. Possibly some day it may be made to serve a purpose in heating houses, but it will certainly afford an abundance of power. Heavy railroad trains are run by that power on a railroad for more than a hundred miles in the Northwest.

The power is dormant now in all of the rivers of the country. With the Government's permission to use the rivers for the purpose, it may be developed, and will be immediately, on many rivers.

There should be no delay about the matter. It is a public necessity. The scarcity of coal would alone make the demand imperative if it were not needed to keep pace with an advancing civilization.

It is sincerely to be hoped that the House will act favorably on this measure, and that when it is a law there may be speedy application of its provisions.

The South has abundant water power, and this section should profit greatly by the water-power development that should follow the enactment of the proper legislation by Congress.

[From the Knoxville Sentinel, Sept. 4, 1917.]

#### WASTE OF WATER POWER.

There is no more urgently needed piece of constructive legislation that is hanging fire in Congress now than the enactment of one of the measures before that body intended to make it possible to finance the development of the invaluable water powers of the Nation that are now running to waste because of the lack of inducement to private enterprise

to harness these powers and make them do the work of millions, while supplying sustenance and employment to many millions of prosperous and happy people.

There are now three measures before Congress of this nature—the Walsh and the Shields bills in the Senate and the Small bill in the House. The character and merits of the Shields bill are fairly well known to the readers of the Sentinel. While it provides for the unlocking of power opportunities in the navigable streams, the bill fully protects the public interests and at the same time safeguards the investment sufficiently to attract private capital for development purposes. This bill has been unanimously and favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Commerce and is at present on the Senate calendar awaiting the action of the Senate.

It is certain that under the existing Federal laws relating to water powers, as interpreted by the United States Supreme Court, private capital can not be interested in further development of these powers. The practical effect of these laws would seem to be a misapplication of the principle of conservation, the aim of which is to open up and utilize our natural resources for humanity, not to lock them up or to keep them locked up in idleness. It is authoritatively estimated that more than 50,000,000 of horsepower is running to waste in American streams. Four-fifths of the possible electric energy that could be developed from water power in this country, according to the New York Annalist, must be developed on lands belonging to the Federal Government, which are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, or on navigable streams which are controlled by the Secretary of War. The agitation in favor of conservation of natural resources resulted in restrictions so severe that resources were not only conserved but reserved. Present laws permitting the utilization of these sites for hydroelectric plants provide that any permit is revocable at the pleasure of the Federal department concerned, and the possibility of this summary action has tended to scare capital away.

The provisions of the legislation sought from the present Congress are briefly stated by the Annalist as follows:

Permits for the erection of hydroelectric plants may be issued to individuals, corporations, States, or municipalities for 50 years.

These contracts are irrevocable, but may be canceled by legal proceedings if the permittee fails to comply with the provisions of the act or the conditions of the permit.

At the expiration of the term the United States may take over the entire plants or any severable and complete unit at a value determined, which shall not include the value of public lands, rights of way, franchises, good will, or prospective revenues; or it may renew the permit to the original holder; or, in the event that such an arrangement can not be made, may issue the permit to some one else, who shall buy the plant under the same conditions.

Rental shall be paid which may in the discretion of the Secretary be based on the net horsepower, and of this rental one-half shall be paid to the State in which the energy is developed.

Permits must provide for the "diligent, orderly, and reasonable development of the water power, subject to market conditions."

Rates are determined by the public service commission of the State in which the power is generated and used, and, when more than one State is involved, by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

These provisions, it seems to us, should amply protect the property rights of the public in these powers, while offering sufficient inducements and safeguards for the investment of capital in them. Especially at this time should these powers be made available to economize our man power and our coal resources in the interest of the general preparedness and national defense. Why Congress does not act upon the matter passes our comprehension. The general principles and policy of the measures before the lawmakers have been studied and indorsed by competent and representative bodies among the people of the country, and we believe it to be an imperative obligation on Congress to act on the subject matter at the present session.

[From the Knoxville Sentinel, Dec. 17, 1917.]

#### SHIELDS POWER BILL.

It is to be hoped that the Shields water-power bill, which has passed the Senate by a generous majority this early in the session, will receive the sanction of the House at an early date and soon become the law of the land. Conservation of natural resources that keeps them hermetically locked up and sealed against practical utility and from giving service to humanity more than defeats itself. It nullifies the very efforts of heaven itself to bestow its blessings on mankind. Some inducement is necessary to encourage enterprise and capital to venture upon the task of harnessing the unbroken waters that run riotously to waste on a hundred hills and in a thousand streams and to cause them, through the generation of the mystic and potent electric fluid, to take the place of human labor in the rougher spheres—to warm, to illuminate, to comfort, and elevate the millions. But the people's natural and riparian rights in the water powers can be and have been safeguarded, as gauged by all contractual and legal standards, in the Shields bill, and it can not too quickly become the law, as it will do if it reaches President Wilson's hands, for the President is understood to approve the Shields bill, and that alone is a sure guaranty that there is nothing hostile to the people's interests in it that can be guarded against by human care and integrity of purpose.

[From the Knoxville Journal and Tribune, Dec. 17, 1917.]

#### THE SHIELDS WATER BILL.

Senator JOHN K. SHIELDS, senior Senator from Tennessee, some time ago introduced a bill the object of which is to utilize the water power of the country, so much of which has been going to waste. Senator SHIELDS has studied the whole matter deeply, and was able to tell about the immense advantage to come from harnessing and putting to work the streams of the country for running machinery and for purposes that have not before been considered seriously.

The bill was opposed by some men who were unable to understand what it meant and by some men in Congress whose constituencies had less to derive from it than some others. It was also opposed by some wiseacres, who vainly imagine themselves to be an Atlas with the world on their shoulders.

The bill was passed in the Senate last Friday by the decisive majority of 46 to 18, more than a two-thirds majority. In securing the passage of the bill, which it is hoped may soon pass in the House and become a law, Senator SHIELDS has done good service for Tennessee, the South, and the whole country. With such a law, the waterways in the country, many of them, will be producing electricity that will reduce the demand for coal, and that will serve the Nation in many



respects. The hope is expressed that the bill may be taken up in the House and passed this week. If so, the President will give it his approval and it will be a law in a few days.

[From the Knoxville Journal and Tribune, Dec. 21, 1917.]

THE SHIELDS POWER BILL.

The Shields water-power bill passed the Senate Saturday in practically the same form that it passed that body in the previous Congress. It failed at that time because of a disagreement on details in the House and Senate conference committee.

The bill provides, as is generally known, for use of rivers for producing electric power. This power would be a substitute for coal in factories and by traction companies and for electric lighting. A plentiful supply of such power would be worth millions to the country in the present crisis and a great boon to the people in releasing large supplies of coal now used in producing power for heating purposes.

The purposes to which this electricity, produced by water power, can be put are not yet fully developed. Possibly some day it may be made to serve a purpose in heating houses, but it will certainly afford an abundance of power. Heavy railroad trains are run by that power on a railroad for more than a hundred miles in the Northwest.

The power is dormant now in all the rivers of the country. With the Government's permission to use the rivers for the purpose, it may be developed, and will be, immediately on many rivers.

There should be no delay about the matter. It is a public necessity. The scarcity of coal would alone make the demand imperative if it were not needed to keep pace with an advancing civilization.

It is sincerely to be hoped that the House will act favorably on this measure, and that when it is a law there may be speedy application of its provisions.

The South has abundant water power and this section should profit greatly by the water-power development that should follow the enactment of the proper legislation by Congress.

[From the Nashville Banner, July 17, 1917.]

SOUTHERN WATER POWER.

There were some rather odd conclusions in the report made to the War Department concerning water power available for a Government plant to obtain nitrogen from the atmosphere, but aside from that phase of the matter the report made one important revelation: it showed that there is much water power in the South running to waste that could and should be made available for various industrial purposes.

Besides atmospheric nitrogen for the manufacture of munitions, there is a vast need for such a substance for making fertilizers. The water power should be utilized for that purpose and it should also be utilized for the probably more immediate necessity of furnishing hydroelectric power for all manner of manufacturing purposes, for street railways, and electric lighting.

The operation of trolley-car systems over various sections of the South would be a much simpler proposition if plenty of water power could be developed for supplying the necessary electric current.

All of this suggests the necessity for some measure like the Shields bill, that failed in the last Congress, that would make possible the development of water power on southern streams.

There is no way in which the South can better develop its natural resources and forge to the front in manufacturing and industrial enterprise than by water-power development.

[From the Memphis Commercial-Appeal, Jan. 18.]

THE FUEL ORDER.

We can not now tell what will be the result of Mr. Garfield's order. We do not know what another day will bring forth. We are certain about nothing in this world except as to the duration of time and the rising and the setting of the sun.

Never in the history of the United States has such a winter swept the face of the earth. Never was cold weather so generally widespread.

In a time of profound peace the resources of the country would have been taxed to furnish coal to the people.

About one-half of the residences and one-fifth of the steam plants of the country might have used other than coal for fuel.

But coal was cheap and easily handled.

Congress yelled mightily at the order of Garfield yesterday.

Our people in this country for 50 years have been eating wheat bread and expecting to keep on eating wheat bread, but the order of Mr. Garfield yesterday brought us to the bottom of the flour bin and the coal bin.

Congress got excited yesterday. Congress ought to have been excited four years ago, and should have passed Senator SHIELDS's bill for the utilization of water power.

There is enough water power in Alabama going to waste to run every furnace, every steam plant and every railroad in Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Georgia.

There is enough escaping water power in Arkansas, if converted into electricity, to run every steam plant in the State and every railroad in the State and supply a surplus to the industries of Missouri.

There is enough escaping water power in the United States to furnish electricity to move more than one-third of the power units in the United States.

Before the Government took over the railroads it should have taken over the coal mines. Then there should have been a tremendous effort to increase the output along lines that would have secured results.

The Government sought to increase the output by advancing wages. The opposite result was secured. One-third of the men, when by working four days earned as much as they formerly had in six days, only worked four.

This paper contains all the information as to Mr. Garfield's order that was available yesterday. We give it to the public for what it is worth. Our readers must analyze it and act according to their best interpretation of it.

[From the Memphis Commercial-Appeal, Dec. 5, 1917.]

SHIELDS BILL GETS HELP FROM MESSAGE—RECOMMENDATION FOR WATER POWER MAKES PASSAGE SURE—BELIEVE THAT COMMENDATION GIVEN BY PRESIDENT WILL RELIEVE MEASURE OF OBSTRUCTIONS WHICH HAVE PREVENTED ITS ENACTMENT.

(By R. M. Gates.)

WASHINGTON, December 4.

President Wilson's recommendation of legislation for the development and use of the water power of the country as an imperative necessity under the present conditions makes the enactment of the Shields bill applicable to water powers in the navigable rivers of the

United States, and the Walsh bill, applicable to nonnavigable streams upon the public domain, also an absolute certainty during the present session of Congress. This is practically the only recommendation of economic legislation not connected with the war contained in the message, which emphasizes the importance of legislation which will permit this great natural resource to be developed and utilized as is being so successfully done in all other civilized countries of the world, but which present restrictive laws, passed some years ago by the ultra-conservationists, now absolutely prohibit. The Members of the Congress who have been interested in these measures are elated over the prominent commendation given them by the President and feel now that their labors, long blocked by obstructionists, will be successful.

These bills are among the greatest constructive measures that have been before Congress for several years and when written into law will be far-reaching in their effect upon transportation by improving navigable rivers with private capital where Congress has been unable to do so on account of immense appropriations required, and in conserving our coal resources for domestic and manufacturing purposes by the use of hydroelectric power.

The wisdom of this legislation is demonstrated by the present congested condition of transportation and the scarcity of fuel now causing so much distress in the homes of thousands of people and embarrassing our mills and factories in every part of the country. Senator SHIELDS is to be congratulated upon this endorsement by the President of the work he has devoted so much time to since he has been in the Senate, for it is seldom that a Senator during his first term has accomplished so much in constructive legislation of national character.

[From the Memphis News-Scimitar, October, 1917.]

A VITAL QUESTION.

One of the most important matters of legislation to be considered during the next session of Congress, which convenes in December, is that providing for the utilization of water power.

President Wilson will, no doubt, urge upon the Congress, as he has in the past, the necessity for the enactment of just and adequate laws looking to the redemption of this vast and invaluable resource, which for so many years has gone to waste.

The Water Power Trust, which practically controls all of the water-power resources in the West, opposes any further legislation. For one thing, no proposed legislation contemplates any such liberal terms as those at present enjoyed by the western power companies, and in order to equalize the terms those concerns now in operation would be compelled to adjust themselves to the new conditions. Some very ingenious gentlemen, who have been subsidized by the water-power interests, have rendered very effective service in preventing legislation on that subject for several years by claiming that whatever bill is introduced is in the interest of the Power Trust. And many ignorant people have actually been persuaded to believe that this is true.

In a recent speech Senator BANKHEAD, of Alabama, said that when the Government nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals in Alabama is completed the product derived from the use of water power will represent a daily saving of 200 carloads of coal.

It is amazing that the Government has postponed so long the construction of this plant. For a number of years the location of a nitrate plant on the Muscle Shoals has been advocated, not alone for the production of nitrates for Government use, but for the production of fertilizer to be used on the farm lands of the South.

The fertilizer question was never so serious as it is at present. It is so closely allied with food production that the two are identical, but if we are to continue to ignore that feature, certainly we can not evade the fuel issue, which has reached almost the proportions of a crisis.

[From the Memphis News-Scimitar.]

THE COUNTRY DEMANDS WATER-POWER LEGISLATION.

The Government of the United States has assumed an obligation unparalleled in the history of the world.

It must furnish foodstuffs to support the peoples of the allied nations at home.

It must furnish foodstuffs and munitions to the allied armies in the field.

It must finance the allied nations in this titanic struggle to make not only the world safe for democracy, but civilization secure on earth.

The President of the United States made no careless assertion when he said the United States has no special grievance against Germany. He meant that this war is in behalf of humanity against inhumanity, civilization against uncivilization. In this cause the allied countries of Europe are sacrificing every earthly possession—for the preservation of the eternal principles of truth and honor they are laying down their lives.

The full import of the part the United States is to have in this world war is coming gradually to the people of this country. The selective draft brought it very near; the casualty lists, when they begin to come back from Europe will bring it home. There is no need to delude ourselves.

To meet these responsibilities the Government is endeavoring to awaken the people to the necessity for conserving potatoes, meat, and bread.

What the country most needs is an awakening to the necessity for greater production. The country needs to find the means of doubling its output of foodstuffs and at the same time reconciling itself to the loss of a million of its producers, and more should they be required.

A situation of this kind should convince the gentlemen of the Congress that the passage of water-power legislation at this session is important and essential. It should be considered distinctively a war measure.

The Shields water-power bill is the best measure ever devised on this subject. It was passed by the Senate at the last session by a vote of 46 to 22, and held up in the House by small politicians without capacity to appreciate its significance and value. The same measure is pending now on the Senate calendar, having been reported unanimously by the Committee on Commerce with a membership of 19 distinguished gentlemen.

There ought to be some means of overcoming the opposition to water-power development, or if the opposition is simply confined to the Shields bill, and the House, in its superior wisdom, can frame a better bill than some other measure for the development of water power should be introduced and passed.

The development of water power is more closely related to the conservation of the resources of this country than any other project that has been proposed. Other countries, Germany, Italy, France, Norway among them, with lands in a high state of cultivation, years ago adopted their water power to the production of fertilizer from atmospheric nitrogen.



The United States, up to the beginning of the war, was dependent largely upon the Chilean nitrate fields for its supply of fertilizer. Since the beginning of the war the price of Chilean nitrate has advanced in price from \$40 to \$85 a ton, and even at that price the lack of transports and the hazard make it practically impossible to reach those fields.

There is no place else to turn for this product, and while we are in distress because we are cut off from our former source of supply, above our heads, over every square mile of land are 20,000,000 tons of atmospheric nitrogen, enough to supply the world with fertilizer for 50 years, which can not be fixed because there is no law permitting the use of the 55,000,000 horsepower of water power annually going to waste in the United States.

Only by the utilization of our great water power in the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen can we ever meet European competition in war and commerce. The countries of Europe, on lands that have been in cultivation for a thousand years, use double the amount of fertilizer per acre that is used in this country, where the virgin fertility should not be exhausted. And for double the amount of fertilizer the European farmer pays no more than the American farmer pays for half the amount, and in addition, the yield in Europe is double that of the United States per acre.

Fertilizer in this country will not be cheaper while the war lasts, under present methods, even if it can be obtained at all, and not cheap enough after the war is over for generous use unless it is made by the water power at our doors where the cost of transportation is saved.

The discussion, like the possibility of water power development, has no limitations. Its greatest obstacle is its immensity—the inability of little minds to grasp its possibilities and its import. One other matter, however, should be called to the attention of the country and to Congress, and that is the coal situation.

The latest available statistics show that each individual in the United States consumes 1,100 pounds of coal annually; that the primary power equipment for commercial purposes in the United States is 30,448,246 horsepower, of which 80 per cent is produced by steam. In this connection it should be observed that the minimum horsepower afforded by the streams of the United States is 32,082,000, or more than the power produced by steam, with a maximum horsepower of 61,678,000, exclusive of 200,000,000 more which may be made available by storage.

There are water-power projects in the United States at this time, representing 2,122,000 horsepower, actually delayed and defeated because of lack of water-power legislation. The development of 1,160 miles of waterways for navigation, without cost to the Government, is delayed for the same reason. Two million one hundred and twenty-two thousand horsepower is equivalent to the energy contained in 8,427,000 tons of coal, and 230,000 thirty-five-ton cars are required to move 8,427,000 tons of coal, and the labor of 7,000 men for one year would be required to mine this coal.

The value of the coal consumed in the United States is fixed normally at \$1,000,000,000. Last year its value increased \$1,000,000. The most accessible and cheapest coal is being mined first. In a year the price has doubled.

The cost of coal, the labor involved in its production, and the expense of transportation and the corresponding waste of water power equivalent to all these are not all.

Urged to their utmost capacity, the railroads can not handle the Nation's traffic. Up to March 1, 1917, there was a shortage of 125,000 cars. The lumbermen alone asked for 50,000 more cars than they could secure.

With the United States at war and its every energy exerted, and with our ships in foreign service commandeered by the Government to act as carriers for troops, war materials, and supplies, there will be an ever-increasing volume of commerce. This emergency must be met, and met at once by proper legislation. It can largely be solved by the development of water power under proper safeguards, and the people ought to demand this legislation.

[From the Memphis News-Scimitar, Oct. 9, 1917.]

#### WATER POWER.

One of the Government's big nitrate plants, to cost approximately \$4,000,000, is to be constructed near Sheffield, Ala., and the Government at last is to utilize the enormous waste of water power that has been the curse of this country for years.

It is well that the country is awakening to the value of water power. It is lamentable that it did not awaken earlier. The United States is the only civilized nation that has not already bridled its water power and made it to serve some useful purpose.

We have been willing to dig from the mines the cheap and easily available coal. We have had the cars on which to ship it, and the price has been such that the people could burn as much as they liked and waste as much as they chose.

Now coal has mounted sky-high. It is out of reach of many people, and actual suffering may result this winter on account of the price. The coal miners in various sections of the country are on a strike because the operators shot up the price of their product without increasing their wages. The cars and equipment of the railroads are in the service of the Government and every available piece of rolling stock is being utilized.

A serious coal shortage exists already. In some places the authorities have confiscated the coal passing through en route to other places where it was needed just as badly.

Chilean nitrate for fertilizer is no longer obtainable. At the beginning of the war it was worth something more than \$30 a ton. Now it costs \$190, when it can be obtained. The crop production will be cut down materially if something is not done to relieve the situation.

A few far-sighted men who have given this subject serious consideration have learned that coal is always going to be relatively high hereafter because of the system of mining; they have learned that fertilizers can not always be secured from Chile, even when there is no war, for the Chilean mines are not inexhaustible.

Their idea is that the vast water power of the United States should be utilized as much as possible, instead of robbing the coal mines of their rapidly diminishing supply. They know that heat, light, and power can be obtained from water power cheaper than from steam power, and that nitrogenous fertilizer can be obtained at the same time by the process of fixation of the atmosphere.

The people need to awaken to this subject and insist upon some legislation during the next session of Congress that will give an opportunity for the development of the water-power resources of this country.

[From the Memphis News-Scimitar, Dec. 6, 1917.]

#### WATER POWER

In an editorial discussing the need for immediate development of the water-power resources of this country, the News-Scimitar of November 24 made this prediction:

"President Wilson will no doubt urge upon the Congress, as he has in the past, the necessity for the enactment of just and adequate laws looking to the redemption of this vast resource which for so many years has gone to waste."

Touching upon this subject in the course of his address before the Congress, the President said:

"It is imperatively necessary that the consideration of the full use of the water power of the country, and also the consideration of the systematic and yet economical development of such of the natural resources of the country as are still under the control of the Federal Government, should be immediately resumed and affirmatively and constructively dealt with at the earliest possible moment. The pressing need for such legislation is daily becoming more obvious."

The vital importance of such legislation is made more apparent by the fact that the development of water power was the only recommendation made outside of the measures necessary for the aggressive prosecution of the war.

The President had in mind, of course, the Shields bill, which he has already approved, and which passed the Senate during the last Congress by an overwhelming majority and is now on the House Calendar, recommended by unanimous vote of the committee for passage, and the Myers bill, which has to do with the development of water power on the public domain.

It is the judgment of the country that there is nothing before the Congress, aside from the war measures, calculated to bring greater relief from fuel prices, which will continue to be a vexing problem so long as we neglect the development of our water power.

[From the Memphis News-Scimitar, Dec. 15, 1917.]

#### SHIELDS BILL PASSES.

The passage of the Shields water-power bill by the United States Senate yesterday was a notable achievement, for the reason that it demonstrates how closely and quickly the Congress is following the recommendations of President Wilson. The water-power legislation contemplated in the Shields bill was the only recommendation made by President Wilson outside of measures for the active conduct of the war.

The fact that the President included it in his address delivered before the joint assemblage of both Houses the second day after the Congress convened indicates that he has recognized the bill as closely aligned with measures necessary for the prosecution of the war.

The fuel question is one of vital concern to this country even now, and unless there is some relief there will be more concern within the next few months. The transportation question is another that is claiming the attention of the best experts on railway matters in the United States. The Government will probably require all of the transportation facilities that the railroads can assemble for the handling of its traffic, and the movement of coal for private concerns and for individual consumers may be handicapped to a large extent.

It is surprising that the people of this country have been so long in recognizing the importance of water-power legislation. If a measure such as the Shields bill is can be passed by the House, it will receive the approval of the President. Then private enterprises, State or municipal authorities may begin to arrange for water power with which to furnish lights and power for the conduct of street railways and for the operation of factories and every kind of enterprise in which power is required and which at present are obliged to use coal. The coal problem for home consumption and for smaller businesses would be solved and there would then be no difficulty in securing all of the coal that is needed and at a reasonable price.

It need hardly be set down here, so well is it known throughout the country, that the Pinchot interests, backed by their millions, have met a signal defeat by the passage of the Shields bill in the Senate. Likewise, there is no comfort for the little coterie of newspaper men in Washington who have been paid liberally, it is said, for their distribution of scurrilous matter against Senator SHIELDS and his bill.

The effort to make it appear that the President opposes the Shields bill is ridiculous in the light of its passage in the Senate. It is an established fact that no measure can pass that body except with the hearty approval of the President, notwithstanding an effort that some newspapers are making, on the eve of a political campaign, to make it appear otherwise.

Those newspapers that endeavor to convince the public that the President is opposed to the Shields bill make the Senator out a stronger man than he is when they claim that he was able to secure the passage of his measure in the Senate over the opposition of the President.

#### BUSINESS MEN'S CLUB, MEMPHIS.

Resolution adopted by the Business Men's Club Chamber of Commerce, Memphis, Tenn., at a regular meeting of the board of directors, May 19, 1916.

Resolved, That the Business Men's Club Chamber of Commerce of Memphis, an association representing the commercial and agricultural interests of Memphis and the prosperity and comfort of a population of 200,000, hereby indorses the Shields bill as passed by the Senate, free from impractical provisions that so disastrously have prevented water-power development in recent years, and hereby respectfully urges upon the House of Representatives the immediate passage of this bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed by the secretary of this association to every Senator and Congressman from the State of Tennessee, and to every commercial and agricultural association with whom this association is in correspondence or affiliation.

[From the Chattanooga News, May 9, 1916.]

The National Conservation Congress indorsed the Shields water-power bill by a vote of 116 to 39. The bill has been much maligned. It is by no means a "grab" measure, and the rights of the public are fully protected. It will develop the waterways. At a time when measures having to do with waterways are classed by the thoughtless as "pork," it is a welcome sign when the Conservation Congress realizes that true conservation means making the best use of the forests and waterways for the public and not, as many believe, keeping hands off of waterways and forests.



[From the Chattanooga News, Mar. 10, 1916.]

# SHIELDS BILL IN THE HOUSE.

The Shields bill, which has passed the Senate and which Senator SHIELDS declares will be followed, if enacted, by early development of water powers aggregating 15,000,000 horsepower, or a volume of electricity equal to that produced by a coal consumption of 100,000,000 tons a year, and meaning the saving of \$700,000 a day in coal bills, will have a hard fight in the House.

Under the Shields bill the Government will have strict supervision of development of water power. While capital is encouraged to help develop the water power and the rivers, the Government does not relinquish supervision. The rentals are to be converted into funds for improving the waterways. The development of the water powers will center interest of the people on the waterways and will force the Government to give the waterways at least halfway adequate treatment.

Some of the strong points of the Shields bill show the manner in which its enactment might bring about the development of waterways throughout the country. Under its terms the Secretary of War is authorized to grant permits for dams and power plants where he believes the building of such dams will improve navigability of streams. Dams are to be built without cost to the Government, and the grantees are to provide and operate locks, gates, sluiceways, etc., all without cost to the Government. Permits may be granted to individuals, political subdivisions of States, cities, or other municipal corporations, or to public-utility corporations. Intrastate business and rates of companies operating under the act are to be regulated by the States, and interstate service and rates by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

All plans for dams and works are to be approved by the War Department as being the most adaptable plans for improvement of navigation and fullest development of water-power possibilities. The grantee is to pay a rental for public lands used and a charge for rights and privileges in use of water, these rights and charges to be fixed at the discretion of the Secretary of War, and the money received from same to go into a special fund in the United States Treasury to be used for further improvement of waterways. Actual construction work on any project is to be begun within two years of the granting of the permit, and the works are to be completed within such reasonable time as the Secretary may prescribe. For failure to complete the works as directed, or for violation of the provisions of the act, or noncompliance with regulations or orders of the War Department, the grantee is subject to heavy cash penalties or to revocation of the grant.

Permits are to be granted for 50 years, after which time the Government may either extend the original lease, make a new grant, or upon one year's notice take over the property upon payment of its fair value, this value to be determined by mutual agreement or by the Federal courts, and not to include any allowance for any rights granted by the Government. The bill also provides that no value of rights granted by the Government shall be allowed in fixing rates to consumers. Dams, locks, and other structures used primarily for improving navigation are to be exempt from taxation.

Leading Chattanoogaans, through the News, expressed themselves as gratified at the passage of the measure in the Senate. It is believed that the Shields bill will open the way for the full realization of the great Muscle Shoals plan.

[From the Chattanooga News, Mar. 9, 1916.]

BILL MEANS MUCH TO CHATTANOOGA—SENATOR SHIELDS CONGRATULATED ON ACHIEVEMENT—LOCAL MANUFACTURERS AND BUSINESS MEN ELATED—\$50,000,000 WILL BE EXPENDED IN BACK YARD OF CHATTANOOGA.

Telegrams of congratulations were sent Senator JOHN K. SHIELDS Thursday by President Fred Arn, of the manufacturers' association; President Huston, of the chamber of commerce; Vice President Z. C. Patten, Jr., of the same organization, and other citizens, expressing gratification at the passage of his river bill through the Senate Wednesday.

According to local manufacturers and capitalists, there will be \$50,000,000 spent in the "back yard of Chattanooga," meaning at Muscle Shoals, as a result of the passage of the bill. They think there is no doubt of its passage through the House, and are regarding the Muscle Shoals development as already a certainty.

Twenty millions will be spent by the Federal Government at the shoals as a result of the bill's passage. Thirty millions of private capital will be added to that. There will be a nitrate plant, and much surplus power delivered to Chattanooga, being an inducement of great pulling power for more great manufacturing plants to locate themselves in Chattanooga, and the consummation of one of Chattanooga's most fervent hopes will be realized—year-around navigation on the Tennessee River.

The expenditure of the Government's \$20,000,000 will come about as a result of the adoption of the General Army Staff plans for the building of a nitrate plant. Muscle Shoals is the only available inland site for such a plant, and with the building of the dam and power plant there the Government will have power already furnished ready for use.

Regarding the building of the dam, financiers have been ready for several years to erect it at any time the Government would allow them to do so. They have not only been ready, but anxious, and it is expected that very little time will elapse before tangible developments will be under way.

[From the Chattanooga News, Dec. 20, 1917.]

# HASTE IS IMPORTANT.

There seems to be a genuine enthusiasm manifesting itself all over the country upon the apparent purpose of Congress to push the water-power bill to early passage. The fuel famine and the shortage of needed power for the operation of the country's industries has brought home to the people the imminent importance of this great conservation measure as nothing else could have done. They are now realizing that action upon it has been too long delayed already. We had hoped that it might be put through before the holidays, but it seems that the House was not quite ready.

As illustrating the magnitude of the possibilities involved in the water-power scheme, the Geological Survey has been compiling some estimates. It is computed that a maximum development of 62,000,000 horsepower could be produced from navigable streams under the provisions of the bill, and this without utilizing the storage, which, it is claimed, would augment the potential horsepower to 200,000,000. Even this huge total does not include the smaller streams not ordinarily considered navigable. Here, it is estimated, 10,000,000 more horsepower

could be made available, and long stretches of streams rendered navigable at the same time. The awakening of the people to the immensity of this great natural asset which is going to waste while the country suffers is doubtless responsible for the observable quickening in Congress.

There is an inadequacy of fuel, of operating power, and of man power now prevailing to discharge the responsibilities with which the country is confronted. The situation daily grows more acute and every hour is important. It will necessarily require time for the assembling and installation of plants and processes for the harnessing of the rivers which are now idly and placidly flowing to the sea. Meantime the country suffers and waits. In this connection, however, it is a matter for local congratulation to observe that much relief will be brought to the Chattanooga district through the development of power consequent upon the erection of the nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals. This work has already been decided upon and undertaken.

A disposition to play politics with the water-power bill has been observed in Tennessee, but this should wait until the measure has been enacted. The people are not only much interested in the speedy enactment of the bill into law but they are concerned over its terms. They want it so drawn, if possible, as to make it practicable to utilize the wasting water power and to protect them at the same time from the exactions of merciless combinations practically out of reach of the law.

[From the Chattanooga News, Sept. 26, 1917.]

UTILIZE WAR-TIME WATER POWERS—SENATOR SHIELDS URGES SECRETARY OF WAR TO ISSUE PERMITS TO DEVELOP RESOURCES.

Senator WEEKS, of Massachusetts, has had read into the RECORD a statement made by Senator JONES, of Washington, regarding the Shields water-power bill. It had previously been published in the Brooklyn Eagle. The article urges that Congress no longer delay action of laws under which our wasting water powers may be developed.

"The statement shows the importance of the immediate passage of such legislation to the State which I have the privilege of representing in part in the United States Senate."

"Of the 9,700,000 water horsepower in the State of Washington requiring Federal consent before it can be utilized, but 96,000 horsepower, or 1 per cent, has been developed, and the remaining 99 per cent, or 9,600,000 horsepower, is going to waste. Meanwhile we are importing coal from Canada; vast areas of silent desert lands, which, given water, would yield great harvests in these days of food shortage, are held back from reclamation through lack of cheap electric energy for operation of pumping plants; three transcontinental railroads are unable to electrify their systems across the State; and industrial plants, the establishment of which would give us the diversity of industry so badly needed to further our progress and prosperity, are prevented from building."

"By provisions in the river and harbor act of 1890 and 1890 Congress has prohibited the placing of dams in navigable streams without the consent of Congress in each case. No executive authority, unless the stream lies wholly within a single State, in which case the State legislature may grant the authority, subject to approval of plans by the Secretary of War."

"The statute passed by Congress in 1910, known as the general dam act, prescribed the terms under which dams may be placed in navigable streams. During the first two years after the passage of this statute Congress granted its consent to the development of 12 water-power projects in navigable streams, of which but two have been developed, and their financing was only made possible because they were adjuncts to existing systems."

"The other 10 could not be financed under the restrictive terms of the permits granted. Not a single water-power project has been developed in a navigable stream during the past five years. During these years water-power projects actually formulated and ready for development, located in 17 Southern and Western States, aggregating 2,122,000 horsepower, have been prevented from development, as no responsible banker, trustee, or business man would invest a dollar upon the security afforded by such permits."

"A bill drawn and introduced by Senator JOHN K. SHIELDS, of Tennessee, was passed by the Senate at the last session. The bill was amended by the House and sent to conference, was not reported, and died with the close of the last Congress."

"Senator SHIELDS reintroduced the bill (No. 1419) at the present session, and it has been reported without amendment to the calendar by the Commerce Committee, and will undoubtedly again be passed by the Senate."

[From the Chattanooga News, Oct. 23, 1917.]

# WATER POWER AGAIN.

The News has on several occasions stressed the importance of the early enactment of the general water-power bill. This bill while not necessarily an immediately available war measure, is distinctly a vital conservation proposition. And since the war has brought the importance—the necessity even—of conservation into such strong relief, the passage of this bill takes on much of the urgency of a war factor. Just at a time when the manufacturing capacities of the country are being strained to an extreme limit, the coal production is falling short of absolutely needful requirements. A universal famine is imminent. The people are without a necessary supply of fuel. Winter is coming on and, according to the present outlook, it will be a marvel of good fortune if widespread suffering is avoided. And at the very best the factories will be more or less hampered. And still Congress has dawdled over the water-power bill.

As heretofore insisted upon in these columns, the possibilities to be opened by the enactment of the water-power bill are many and great. It is a conservation proposal of far-reaching importance. While the coal supply in the earth may be ample for many generations, its production is not meeting the demands upon it. The output is needed for fuel in the homes of the people without any of it being diverted to the production of power. Unless relief is attained somebody will be in want.

The harnessing of the streams will afford a dependable source of water for our industries at a comparatively stable and uniform cost of production. This last feature is very desirable indeed. And as heretofore pointed out, it will contribute to the solution of the smoke problem in the cities. But it will take time to organize and install the necessary plants to furnish adequate water power, hence the pressing need of prompt legislation. It is to be earnestly hoped that during the coming session Congress will pass this very desirable measure.

An examination of the following extract from a recent article by Dr. Charles P. Steinmetz, an electrical expert, will convince our readers that our vision of the possibilities of water-produced electric power was not at all extravagant:



"When we use nothing but electrical power for heating as well as for other purposes, the supply will come through transmission lines from big central stations of many millions horsepower. These stations will be located wherever power is available, such as at waterfalls, coal mines, and oil and gas wells. This will do away with the wasteful process of hauling coal from the mines to the relatively small power houses scattered all over the country. It may be that at the coal mines, instead of taking out the coal and burning it the way we do now, power will be generated in the mine itself by setting the coal in the veins on fire. No; this is not beyond the dream of possibility. It has already been seriously proposed by an eminent English scientist. Starting will be the changes affected by such a supply of electricity. Electrical power will be used so generally that it is very likely the cost will be on the basis of a tax, like our water tax. For example, so much a plug, as we are now charged so much a faucet. It will be very cheap and it will not pay to install meters and have them read and keep the accounts in the offices of the electric companies. To-day water is used universally, and no one would think of making a charge to a friend or even a stranger for any amount of it. If you make a call in your electric vehicle, the vehicle will be run into your friend's basement and the batteries will be charged while you are making your call. It won't make any difference whether you get your electric current from your friend's plug or from the plug in your own home—the tax will remain the same.

After contemplating this picture it does not require a very big stretch of the imagination to see electric power sold at the corner grocery to those who may not have home connection with the plant. A cantaliner may be taken along and the amount desired be carried home much like a basket of spuds. Why not supply stations for electric power as well as gasoline?

[From the Chattanooga Times, Chattanooga, Tenn., Mar. 16, 1916.]

**THIS CITY TO GET BENEFIT—RIVER MAY BE IMPROVED AS AN INCIDENT TO PREPAREDNESS—MANY COMPLIMENTS PAID SHIELDS FOR HIS VICTORY—COMMERCIAL AS WELL AS MILITARY IMPORTANCE CONNECTED WITH PROJECT FOR ESTABLISHING NITROGEN PLANT AT MUSCLE SHOALS.**

Having just returned from Washington, a local business man and manufacturer gives the following impressions gathered at the National Capital:

One of the members of the brigade post committee made a very interesting report, giving some information gathered at Washington which is welcome news to those interested in the development of this section.

Among other things he commented on the fact that while in Washington last August he found very few Members of Congress who happened to be there and very few citizens throughout the North and East who had much interest in the question of the fixation of nitrates from the air. Only a few who had made a study of this condition abroad and who were familiar with what it had meant to Germany in the past 12 months were talking, only in a general way, about the nitrate needs of this country. Since that time a tremendous volume of literature has been compiled and distributed throughout every State in the Union and placed in the hands of every Member of Congress, until now the entire country is alive to the fact that something must be done to free this country from its dependence on Chile.

Certainly anyone who spends time in Washington will not fail to hear from almost every quarter compliments paid to the fine manner in which Senator SHIELDS conducted the fight for his general dam act. And certainly one less skilled in a parliamentary way than Judge SHIELDS would have been far less successful. This act, having met all the so-called "conservation opposition" that was possible, and coming through with such a tremendous majority, practically insures its passage through the House; but much more difficulty would have been experienced had not the general feeling been so strong for power developments to meet the requirements of the Government, which made everyone feel kindly to any measure that looked to the utilization of this waste energy and the applying of it in some practical way.

#### URGENT FEATURE OF THE PREPAREDNESS MOVEMENT.

Two significant things happened last week which have been noted in the press, but their significance was especially realized by those who have been in direct touch with the affairs in Washington. One was the meeting in New York of the Naval Advisory Board and the report of Dr. W. R. Whitney, of Schenectady, N. Y., who had been delegated to make a report on the production of nitrogen from the air. His report was unanimously approved, and among other things, were these significant statements: That the Naval Advisory Board should urge President Wilson to take such steps immediately as might be necessary to create a commission, preferably from the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, War, and Navy, to make effective immediately such plans as might be necessary for the Government production of nitrogen from the air, further stressing the fact that it is not only immediately vital from the standpoint of "preparedness," but equally important from an economic standpoint in making adequate fertilizer for the farmers at a reasonable price. The commission was urged to plan immediately for the utilization of water powers in working out the proposed plant or plants. The next day there appeared from the Government press, Report No. 297, from Mr. Hay, as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, together with a report on the hearing before that committee, on ways and means for increasing the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States. This report is one of 24 pages, and while it deals with all phases of "preparedness," the following paragraph stands out paramount in the entire report:

"The bill also provides for the authorization of the plan for the manufacture of nitrogen in order to supply the country with powder to make it independent in time of war of every foreign source of nitrogen. This committee considers this question of the first importance in the consideration of preparedness for national security."

Following this, in small type, six pages are devoted to the arguments and data in favor of such a proposed measure. With this report coming from the Military Affairs Committee, backed by the sentiment in the Senate, as evidenced by the Shields bill, also coupled with the report of the Committee on Agriculture, emphasizing the nitrogen interest as of first importance from the agricultural standpoint, it almost seems that the bill authorizing the appropriation for an air-nitrogen plant would be passed quickly and by an overwhelming majority.

#### BETTER WATERWAY AT CHATTANOOGA IN PROSPECT.

While the proposed measure will not designate Muscle Shoals as the location for this plant, it is a fact that the Government engineers have not made a report on any other adequate location and almost all of the prominent dailies throughout the country have published the statement

that when this bill was passed it would mean the immediate designation of Muscle Shoals and immediate work on the large dam at that point. This would then leave but two smaller dams, which would be entirely incidental, and of course they would be provided for at an early date through the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House and the Commerce Committee of the Senate. In fact, one of the most influential United States Senators made the statement that the very importance of the Tennessee River would not even require another visit from a delegation, as they would be put through as soon as work could begin without any fight.

When it is considered that only a small proportion of the power will be necessary for Government use and a large proportion will be utilized for industrial purposes, all of which or a great part of which can be economically utilized here in Chattanooga, the passage of this measure will mean the biggest development for the South that has ever come our way; and coupled with all, it gives us at least 6 feet in the Tennessee River from Chattanooga to Paducah 12 months in the year.

[From the Chattanooga Times.]

#### THE SHIELDS WATER-POWER BILL.

The Shields water-power bill pending in Congress has been attacked by Mr. Gifford Pinchot and others on the ground that it opens up the way for selfish personal interests to absorb all the water power of the country, thus putting the people in the grip of a merciless trust. In brief, the bill, which gets its name from the author, Senator JOHN K. SHIELDS, of this State, repeals the Federal statute providing that in order to build dams for water power or other structures across or in navigable streams an act of Congress granting the right must be passed. The Shields bill restores the right to grant the privilege to the State wherein the water power sought to be developed is situated and to the riparian owners, a right that prevailed until a few years ago. The provision of the present law can be well illustrated by a reference to the procedure necessary to the building of the Hale Bar Lock and Dam and the Market Street Bridge. The purpose of the Shields bill is to make such enterprises possible without a congressional enactment.

It is stated that the War Department has endorsed the measure and that the public welfare requires it, since under existing laws the development of the water-power resources of the country is practically impossible. The Shields bill authorizes companies and corporations, with preference to municipalities and public-utility companies, to build dams in navigable streams for power-development purposes without resort to Congress, after having first submitted their plans and obtained the approval and permit of the Secretary of War, upon certain conditions that he may impose, including the construction of locks in the dams and other facilities for navigation at the expense of the developing company. The permit will continue for a term of 50 years, unless sooner forfeited for violation of its terms, at which time the property may be taken over by the United States and re-leased under then existing laws.

Other safeguards are included in the measure which, it would seem, ought to satisfy the most sensitive reservationist, since it is made practically impossible for any company or trust to exploit the people or deprive them of their rights, either by exorbitant charges or combination in restraint of the free use of navigable streams for purposes of transportation. It is pointed out by Senator SHIELDS that the passage of this act is necessary to the full development of the wonderful resources of the Tennessee River, and it is suggested that on its passage may depend the erection of an enormous plant near Muscle Shoals for the generation of hydroelectricity for the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen used in the manufacture of fertilizer and high explosives, all of which is now almost exclusively imported from Chile at an annual expenditure of \$21,000,000.

If, as seems to be the case from the documents accompanying the copies of the bill sent to this office, the public rights are securely safeguarded and the avenues for the development of the country's resources are thereby opened up without harm to the welfare of the people or the abridgment of the Government's authority over navigable streams, the passage of this measure would at once stimulate development of water-power resources all over the country, and especially along the Tennessee River, the waters of which, it is stated, are susceptible of developing more than a million horsepower of electrical energy. We have not noticed that under the present law anything more than trouble and delay have been occasioned, for Congress has generally granted such rights as have been asked; the Shields bill will, therefore, only facilitate the developments necessary to make the Tennessee potential in the building up of the sections through which it runs.

[From the McMinnville (Tenn.) Standard, Feb. 24, 1917.]

#### THE SHIELDS WATER-POWER BILL.

When the water power at Muscle Shoals is utilized electricity can be furnished near-by cities at a nominal cost, providing the Lighting Trust does not take over the water power at that place. Senator SHIELDS'S bill, which passed the Senate, is hung up in the House, and its passage is problematic, for the reason that it is said to open the door for the powerful Lighting Trust to come in and absorb this enormously valuable popular asset. (Memphis News-Scimitar.)

One of the greatest obstacles public men who undertake enterprises for the public welfare encounter in accomplishing their purposes is the inexplicable negligence of the public, and especially the newspapers, supposedly the purveyors of information and the disseminators of truth, to properly acquaint themselves with the facts relating to such enterprises. The News-Scimitar ought to know, for it is very plainly stated in the Shields bill, that the "Lighting Trust" can not, neither can any other combination, get control of the water power of Muscle Shoals when the Shields bill shall become law. On the contrary, it is expressly forbidden, and is so provided that if anything of the sort shall be attempted the Government may interfere and prevent it. It is also provided in this bill that all concessions shall expire at the end of 50 years, if at that time "the Government shall decide to operate the plant, or it may be renewed under such terms as the Congress may prescribe. In fact, every precaution is taken in the bill to safeguard the public, so that to say its purpose is to monopolize power against the interests of the people is so grossly unfair as to discredit the intelligence of those charging it. A provision is made likewise limiting the charges at which the product may be sold, so that there can be no such thing as public exploitations under its provisions.

We do not know that even the most radical opponents of the bill make the charge that the "Lighting Trust" may be able under it to exploit the people, their chief objection being that it turns over to private enterprise the energies that ought to be reserved for the uses of the whole people at some future time, their contention being that the 50-year limitation of the law will not be binding as against powerful private or corporate influences.



The real question involved is, Shall this great power remain undeveloped and of no earthly use to the present generation because there is a suspicion that private concerns are trying to get such control that coming generations will be deprived of their natural patrimony? The Government will not develop it for the uses of the people; private enterprises will. Must we, therefore, submit to the policy that means the restraint of immediate development in the idea that to do otherwise might endanger the peace or happiness of future generations? In other words, are we to permit this great power to go to waste until such time as the Government may decide to go into the business of furnishing light and power to the people? If developments of the present will aid and help future generations—and who shall say that past activities in the development of the wealth nature has provided for the races of men have not benefited the present generations—then we should insist either upon the passage of the Shields bill or the decision of the Government to give us the benefits the Shields bill will provide. (Chattanooga Times.)

[From the Morristown (Tenn.) Republican, Nov. 29, 1917.]

It is time to mobilize the 50,000,000 undeveloped water horsepower owned by the people of the United States. Resources yet untouched would furnish enough power to operate every train, trolley, factory, mine, and electric plant in the country. This development has been delayed by a little group of water-power magnates and their representatives in Congress. The safety and success of the Nation in the gigantic struggle in which we are engaged demand immediate relief from water-power obstruction.

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, Jan. 14, 1918.]

#### ON GIVING US A PAIN.

Mr. Gilson Gardner, who has been writing progressive politics for several years and saying a great many things which caused us to wonder why he said them, can sit down at his typewriter and jot down offhand the names of the United States Senators the people of the different States ought to reelect, and likewise the names of those the people should leave at home. Mr. Gardner has just begun his latest campaign of proscription and merciful approval.

In his declaration Mr. Gardner is at some pains to inform us that Miss JEANNETTE RANKIN, of Montana, contemplates asking for a United States Senatorship, in succession to THOMAS JEFFERSON WALSH, who is not in good health. Reviewing the Montana lady's record of achievement as a legislator, Mr. Gardner concludes that "altogether Miss RANKIN has qualified for promotion."

We infer also from the article in question that it would please Mr. Gardner if the people of Minnesota would kindly leave Senator KNUTE NELSON at home. But when the writer comes upon the name of Senator JOHN K. SHIELDS, of Tennessee, then it is that his Bolshevik ire is stirred to a pitch comparable to his enthusiasm for the Hon. JEANNETTE RANKIN, of Montana.

"JOHN K. SHIELDS, of Tennessee, author of the Shields water-power grab," we read, "will have a chance to submit his candidacy to the people of Tennessee next summer, and if they do not like having a Senator who is primarily a representative of the predatory interests they may choose somebody else in his place."

Mr. Gardner is a Gifford Pinchot progressive; that is to say, he is a survivor of a diminishing breed.

If the Shields bill had no better indorsement than the denunciation of a Bolshevik journalist who seriously believes, or pretends to believe, that a woman—particularly a woman of the quaint point of view of Miss RANKIN—should be sent to the United States Senate by a responsible people, the measure would still be worthy the respect of thoughtful people. But, fortunately, the Shields bill has other merits to commend it and few, if any, defects to discredit it before a commonsense public. The Shields bill permits private capital to develop, under stable governmental conditions, our waterpowers which for a million years and more have washed merrily over the rocks onward to the yawning seas. Pinchot and Gardner would have private capital invest in these power projects, but under conditions which would necessarily frighten away responsible capital.

Pinchot and Gardner as capital baiters are of a piece with the small boy who won't go to bed himself because he's afraid the old "booger" man will catch him.

[From the Morristown (Tenn.) Gazette, December, 1917.]

#### THE SHIELDS POWER BILL.

It is to be hoped that the Shields water-power bill, which has passed the Senate by a generous majority this early in the session, will receive the sanction of the House at an early date and become the law of the land. Conservation of natural resources that keeps them hermetically locked up and sealed against practical utility and from giving service to humanity more than defeats itself. It nullifies the very efforts of heaven itself to bestow its blessings upon mankind. Some inducement is necessary to encourage enterprise and capital to venture upon the task of harnessing the unbroken waters that run riotously on to waste on a hundred hills and in a thousand streams and to cause them, through the generation of the mystic and potent electric fluid, to take the place of human labor in the rougher of the spheres—to warm, to illuminate, to comfort, and elevate the millions. But the people's natural and riparian rights in the water powers can be and have been safeguarded, as gauged by all contractual and legal standards, in the Shields bill, and it can not too quickly become the law, as it will do if it reaches President Wilson's own hands, for the President is understood to appreciate and approve the Shields bill, and that alone is a sure guaranty that there is nothing hostile in the bill to the people's interests that can be guarded against by human care and integrity of purpose.

[From the News Banner, Murfreesboro, Tenn., Dec. 21, 1917.]

SHIELDS WATER-POWER BILL PASSES SENATE—IT IS OF VITAL INTEREST TO THE COUNTRY IN THE PROSECUTION OF THE WAR.

Two measures of transcendent interest to the West and vital interest to the whole country in the prosecution of the war by unlocking national resources were started on the road to achievement in Congress last Friday.

The Shields water-power bill for leasing of power sites in navigable streams was passed by the Senate and sent to the House on that day.

This is the bill our distinguished senior Senator fought nobly for, but was lost in a hopeless deadlock in the last session of Congress.

To hasten passage of the bill for leasing oil lands, which is expected to open the way for development of wells to meet the fuel shortage, Senate leaders agreed to abandon all attempts to make the bill apply to

the naval reserve lands in California and Wyoming and to preserve these lands intact for naval fuel, having the Government take over existing claims by condemnation proceedings.

This latter decision removes an obstacle which has precipitated a great fight in Congress and held up oil-land development in the West.

Water-power legislation is now being considered by the House Committee on the Public Lands, which is understood to be negotiating an agreement to harmonize differences which caused failure of the legislation a year ago.

Passage of the Shields bill by the Senate—46 to 18—was the first step in disposing of natural-resources-development legislation before the holidays, as recommended by the President in his recent address. Under the measure water-power development on navigable streams would be under control of the War Department.

A system of 50-year permits is provided to encourage private concerns to make expenditures for dams on navigable streams for development purposes.

In announcing that all provisions for the opening of naval-reserve land in California and Wyoming will be excluded from the bill for leasing oil lands, Senator PITTMAN, in charge of the measure, said this decision resulted from opposition to the section by the Navy Department and a number of Senators.

The demands for oil are increasing so rapidly, Senator PITTMAN said, that estimates of the possible shortage, unless additional fields are opened, are beyond imagination. Because of this condition, he added, many Senators have set aside their personal views regarding lands in order to permit enactment of some legislation to relieve the situation.

[From the Jackson Sun, Dec. 16, 1917.]

WATER-POWER ACT WILL BE GREAT HELP—SENATOR SHIELDS OF TENNESSEE AUTHOR OF THE MEASURE.

WASHINGTON, December 15.

By a vote of 46 to 18 the Senate Friday passed the Shields water-power bill entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce."

The bill in substantially the same form was adopted by the Senate at the session of the Sixty-fourth Congress by a slightly reduced majority. Senator SHEPPARD of Texas was one of the Senators voting for the bill to-day who opposed it a year ago. Senator SHIELDS of Tennessee, author of the bill, made the leading affirmative argument, which several Senators who desired "additional enlightening information" on the subject admitted afterward removed the lingering vestiges of doubt that had held their decision in abeyance. Senator UNDERWOOD of Alabama also spoke at length in support of the measure. The principle of the Shields bill parallels the cleavage of legislation for water-power development urged by President Wilson, both in messages to Congress and in private interviews.

#### PROVISIONS OF BILL.

The bill provides primarily for the improvement of navigation in rivers, under the jurisdiction of Congress, with private capital, as distinguished from appropriations by Congress for that purpose, and, secondarily, for the development and utilization of water power of those rivers resulting from such improvement, as well as that created by dams constructed and to be constructed under the authority of Congress. The secondary purpose of the bill is the inducement for the investment of private capital in the improvement of navigable streams and without which it would not be so invested or improvements made.

The provisions for the development of navigation, present and future, of navigable rivers are carefully prepared to accomplish that object, the improvement to be made in all cases in accordance with plans submitted to and approved by the Secretary of War and Chief of Engineers, and constructed under their supervision, all with a view primarily of promoting and protecting navigation facilities. In fact, the improvements are required to be made and maintained according to such plans and in such manner as if they were solely for navigation purposes and to be paid for out of the Treasury of the United States.

The Commerce Committee of the Senate, which reported the bill for passage, said among other things:

"It is believed that the bill provides a way by which many of the navigable rivers of the country can be opened to commercial navigation, which, for the want of available means, can not for years be improved in the ordinary way by appropriations from the Treasury of the United States, provided the provisions covering the secondary object of the bill are broad enough and liberal enough to attract private capital desiring to invest in water-power development, for it is obvious, without great inducement of individual interest and advantage, private capital will not be invested in an improvement for the sole benefit of the general public."

"The committee is also of the opinion that the secondary object of the bill—that is, the development and utilization of the water power of navigable streams—is of equal importance to the primary object, although it is in a sense incidental to it, and it is believed that the provisions of the bill concerning this are ample to accomplish that purpose."

"It is estimated that there is in the navigable rivers of the United States, exclusive of Alaska, and also of what may be developed by feasible storage projects, over 61,000,000 horsepower of water-power energy, not more than one-tenth of which is now improved and utilized. This great natural resource is in all other civilized countries developed practically to its fullest extent, and has, and is now, by furnishing cheap power, contributing greatly to the wealth of those countries and the convenience and happiness of their people."

#### PRODUCTION OF HYDROELECTRIC ENERGY.

"The economical and industrial advantages to the people of the United States that will result from the development of hydroelectric energy produced by utilization of water power is difficult to overestimate. There are many things which can be accomplished by steam power produced in the consumption of fuel. The value of cheap power for manufacturing, lighting, and transportation purposes is, of course, recognized by everyone. Perhaps the greatest necessity and use for it at this time is in the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen for the manufacture of fertilizers and explosives."

"The committee is of the opinion that the bill is so framed as to protect and maintain the constitutional power and control of the Federal Government over navigable streams, as well as the sovereignty of the States and the rights of riparian proprietors over and in the beds and waters of those streams, and allow the full exercise and enjoyment of the latter, subject to the paramount authority of Congress to regulate the same for navigable purposes."



"It is believed that under the provisions of this bill the water-power resources of the country will be developed and utilized and future waste prevented, which is conservation in its highest and truest sense."

The bill goes to the House, where its passage is predicted. Unquestionably it will take rank with any piece of constructive legislation this Congress will consider, and Senator SHIELDS was congratulated to-day upon the initial success of his bill.

[From the Johnson City Staff, Mar. 3, 1916.]

#### THE SHIELDS BILL.

United States Senator JOHN K. SHIELDS is to be congratulated on putting through the Senate one of the most important pieces of constructive legislation that has come to a vote in many sessions—the bill which enables the Secretary of War to grant 50-year permits for the building of dams and water-power plants on navigable streams.

This is the first vote taken by the Senate on a general water-power development measure in the eight years that the subject of conservation of natural resources has been under consideration in Congress. Two water-power bills passed the House last year and died in the Senate.

Senate leaders and military authorities urged the Shields bill as a vital feature of the preparedness program. It is estimated that there is 60,000,000 horsepower of natural energy in the navigable streams of the United States, of which nine-tenths is flowing to waste. These great water powers have been locked out from us up to now, as a special act of Congress has been necessary for each power plant, and it has been impossible to pass workable acts for the development of large water powers.

Senator SHIELDS announced in the Senate that the passage of this bill would be followed by early development of water powers aggregating 15,000,000 horsepower, or a volume of electricity equal to that produced by a coal consumption of 100,000,000 tons a year. Engineers estimate that development of this amount of water power equals a saving of \$700,000 a day in coal bills.

It is known that a number of big electrochemical plants for making saltpeter and nitric acid from the air have been planned by private enterprises, and will be built as soon as the Shields bill becomes a law and makes it possible to finance these undertakings. These chemicals are essential to the manufacture of explosives and agricultural fertilizers, and at present the United States is wholly dependent for its supply upon the nitrate deposits of Chile. The Chilean Government collects a high tax upon every ton of nitrate exported. There is at present not a single atmospheric nitrogen plant in this country, although Europe has 1,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectricity devoted to this use, and Germany is making 600,000 tons of saltpeter a year in such establishments for military and agricultural uses.

A few years ago Congressman SELLIS told the Staff that it was his ambition to have located in the first district several of these plants, and it begins to look now like he will realize his ambition, for the passage of the Shields bill opens the door of opportunity.

Under the terms of the Shields bill the Secretary of War is authorized to grant permits for dams and power plants where he believes the building of such dams will improve navigability of streams. Dams are to be built without cost to the Government, and the grantees are to provide and operate locks, gates, sluiceways, etc., all without cost to the Government. Permits may be granted to individuals, political subdivisions of States, cities, or other municipal corporations, or to public-utility corporations. Intrastate business and rates of companies operating under the act are to be regulated by the States, the interstate service and rates by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

All plans for dams and works are to be approved by the War Department, as being the most adaptable plans for improvement of navigation and fullest development of water-power possibilities. The grantee is to pay a rental for public lands used and a charge for rights and privileges in use of water, these rentals and charges to be fixed at the discretion of the Secretary of War, and the money received from same to go into a special fund in the United States Treasury, to be used for further improvement of waterways. Actual construction work on any project is to be begun within two years of the granting of the permit, and the works are to be completed within such reasonable time as the Secretary may prescribe. For failure to complete the works as directed, or for violation of the provisions of the act, or non-compliance with regulations or orders of the War Department, the grantee is subject to heavy cash penalties or to revocation of the grant.

Permits are to be granted for 50 years, after which time the Government may either extend the original lease, make a new grant, or upon one year's notice take over the property upon payment of its fair value, this value to be determined by mutual agreement or by the Federal courts, and not to include any allowance for any rights granted by the Government. The bill also provides that no value of rights granted by the Government shall be allowed in fixing rates to consumers. Dams, locks, and other structures used primarily for improving navigation are to be exempt from taxation.

Municipally owned dams and power plants for irrigation or for supplying power for municipal purposes are to be given preference in making leases for surplus water powers in the streams. The bill does not apply to water power on small streams and creeks used for grist mills, sawmills, etc.

The measure contains a drastic antimonopoly clause, providing that no dam or works constructed under its provisions shall be owned, leased, controlled, or operated "by any device or in any manner so that they form part of or in any way effect any combination in the form of an unlawful monopoly, or form the subject of an unlawful constraint or conspiracy to limit the output of electrical energy or in restraint of trade."

Although the war talk has prevented it from attracting any considerable public attention, the Shields bill has for several weeks been the subject of one of the most interesting debates on conservation of natural resources that has ever been held in the Senate.

Senator SHIELDS has served in the Senate only a brief time, but during that period he has displayed qualities of leadership and constructive statesmanship which have delighted his friends and confounded his enemies. That he should have sponsored such an important piece of legislation so early in his senatorial career, his admirers believe, presages a large career of service to the State and to the Nation.

[From the Brooklyn Daily Eagle, Sept. 15, 1917.]

#### PASSAGE OF THE SHIELDS BILL URGED TO DEVELOP NATION'S WATER POWER.

(By WESLEY L. JONES, United States Senator from Washington.)

It is vitally important to the economic and commercial welfare of this Nation that Congress no longer delay the enactment of laws under which our wasting water powers may be developed. The following brief

statement shows the importance of the immediate passage of such legislation to the State which I have the privilege of representing in part in the United States Senate.

Of the 9,700,000 water horsepower in the State of Washington requiring Federal consent before it can be utilized, but 96,000 horsepower, or 1 per cent, has been developed, and the remaining 99 per cent, or 9,600,000 horsepower, is going to waste. Meanwhile, we are importing coal from Canada; vast areas of silent desert lands, which given water would yield great harvests in these days of food shortage, are held back from reclamation through lack of cheap electric energy for operation of pumping plants; three transcontinental railroads are unable to electrify their systems across the State, and industrial plants, the establishment of which would give us the diversity of industry so badly needed to further our progress and prosperity, are prevented from building.

By the provisions in the river and harbor act of 1890 and 1899 Congress has prohibited the placing of dams in navigable streams without the consent of Congress in each case. No executive authority, unless the stream lies wholly within a single State, in which case the State legislature may grant the authority, subject to approval of plans by the Secretary of War. As navigable streams almost invariably touch or traverse more than one State, the exception is unimportant.

An existing statute, passed by Congress in 1910, known as the general dam act, prescribes the terms under which dams may be placed in navigable streams when Congress grants specific consent. This statute, even if made operative by an enabling act, makes requirements which render investment unsafe and effectually prevents development. During the first two years after the passage of this statute Congress granted its consent to the development of 12 water-power projects in navigable streams, of which but two have been developed, and their financing was only made possible because they were adjuncts to existing systems.

The other 10 could not be financed under the restrictive terms of the permits granted. Not a single water-power project has been developed in a navigable stream during the past five years. During these years water-power projects actually formulated and ready for development, located in 17 Southern and Western States, aggregating 2,122,000 horsepower, have been prevented from development, as no responsible banker, trustee, or business man would invest a dollar upon the security afforded by such permits. The production of this energy through utilization of water horsepower now wasting would save annually 8,427,000 tons of coal, would allow the labor of 7,000 men to be used for other much-needed purposes, and would permit the use of thousands of cars for carrying merchandise instead of coal. Furthermore, by these river improvements 1,160 miles of inland waterways would be opened to navigation without the appropriation of Government money.

The importance of action is realized by Congress, which has had the enactment of a new navigable-stream water-power law under consideration for the past four years. A bill drawn and introduced by Senator JOHN K. SHIELDS, of Tennessee, was passed by the Senate at the last session by a vote of 46 to 22 after a discussion covering a period of five weeks, during which time every phase of the question was carefully considered. The bill was amended by the House and sent to conference, was not reported out, and died with the close of the last Congress.

Senator SHIELDS reintroduced the bill (No. 1419) at the present session, and it has been reported without amendment to the calendar by the Commerce Committee, of which I am a member, and will undoubtedly again be passed by the Senate when its consideration is reached. The bill has been criticized by so-called conservationists for reasons which I shall not attempt to controvert, because, to my mind, they are manifestly impracticable and, if adopted, would effectually prevent development.

The bill appeals to me as an orderly, masterly product of high-class statesmanship. It safeguards every public interest, and yet its terms are fair toward those who would engage in the naturally hazardous business of development of water powers. Senator JOHN K. SHIELDS, the author of the bill, is one of the most respected Members of the United States Senate. He was formerly chief justice of the Supreme Court of Tennessee, and the development of its water powers is of greatest importance to his State. I am glad to be able to say that this important national question was not made a party issue in its consideration by the Senate, and I am glad, as a Republican Senator, to be able to line up alongside the great Democratic Senator from Tennessee in approval of his views upon this subject.

The Shields bill authorizes the Secretary of War to issue permits to develop water powers in navigable streams to properly qualified applicants who, in his judgment, are best fitted in the public interest to develop the water resources. The bill sets forth at length general terms and stipulations, and the Secretary of War is made the administrative authority to carry them into effect. The bill provides for a permit period of 50 years, at any time after which the Government may, on 2 years' notice, take over the property for itself or for a subsequent grantee by paying the fair value of the property, not including the rights granted by the Government. The bill provides for protection of the public interests as follows:

(a) Water-power projects for which permits are issued must be such as in the judgment of the Secretary of War shall be best adapted to a comprehensive plan for the improvement of waterways for all uses and produce the highest practicable power development.

(b) The public service commissions of the States in which the water powers are located are given control of rates and service when the business is intrastate, and the same regulatory authority is conferred upon the Interstate Commerce Commission when the business is interstate.

(c) The Secretary of War is given authority to examine the books of the grantee and to require them to submit sworn statements of every detail of their business transactions.

(d) Provision is made for cancellation of the grant in case the grantee fails to comply with the terms.

(e) Unlawful trust or monopoly or restraint of trade is forbidden.

(f) The grantee is required to install, at his own expense, locks, booms, sluices, lights, signals, or other structures in aid of navigation purposes, and furnish, free of cost, power for operation of same.

(g) The grantee must reimburse the United States for the cost of investigation and supervision incidental to the transaction.

(h) The grantee is required to pay reasonable charges to the United States for benefits accruing from headwater improvements established and maintained by the United States and for the use of any Government land used in power development.

The bill provides that work must be begun within two years from the date of the permit and completed within such time as may be specified by the Secretary of War, and provides for diligent, orderly, and reasonable development and continuous operation of the water power, subject to market conditions. The bill provides that contracts extending be-



yond the life of the permit for sale of energy may not be made without permission of the public service commission of the State in which the water power is located.

The Shields bill is distinctly a compromise measure. It is the product of the long conflict of views and of the efforts of the Senate to deal intelligently with the subject. Like all compromise measures, it is probably not completely satisfactory to anyone, but as a whole it concededly does safeguard the public interests and concededly is fair enough to capital to secure investment in water powers. In my judgment, it is not at all subject to the objections which have been most vehemently urged against such proposed legislation in the past. Consequently it can and should be supported both by those who have been chiefly interested in insisting upon public safeguards and also by those whose chief interest has been to secure development of the great resources. It is to be hoped that, in the public interest, this bill may be accepted by both Houses of Congress, be signed by the President, and speedily become a law.

[From the Springfield (Ill.) State-Register, Aug. 14, 1917.]

#### THE SHIELDS WATER-POWER BILL.

Senator JOHN K. SHIELDS has introduced a bill in the United States Senate providing for the financing of water-power development. There has been an almost inexcusable difference on the part of the Government in making effective the great water-power resources of this country. Water power is a cheap and highly efficient power. If there was ever a time in the history of the Nation when water power should be developed, that time is now.

The great unused stands of pulp-wood timber that are now controlled by the present paper makers are almost without exception in sections of the country where the available water powers lie, either in the public domain or on navigable streams. Power is absolutely essential to the conversion of wood into pulp, and water power is the most logical power.

The Senate of the United States can strike effectively at the heart of the Paper Trust if it passes effective water-power legislation. The people of the country should get actively behind the Shields bill and urge its passage.

The paper combine that has so arrogantly defied the Government in its price manipulation will naturally oppose the Shields bill. This fact should make the people rally to its support.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Post-Express, Sept. 29, 1917.]

We are earnestly warned of the necessity of conserving our coal supply. One way to save coal would be substituting some other agent to create power for manufactures. We have water power in the country totaling in excess of 60,000,000 horsepower and we are utilizing little more than 5,000,000 horsepower. There are before Congress a number of bills which would make possible at once the development of water powers by private capital. Of three of these—the Shields bill, the Walsh bill, and the Small bill—Secretary Houston is an advocate. He declares that in the print-paper situation alone the release of water powers to utilization would make available to the manufacture of paper waste timber enough to provide wood pulp for many years. There are other manufacturers which would be facilitated in the same way by these and by other bills. Of the bills themselves it is impossible to write until their provisions are known. There may be reasons why they should not be passed; there may be injustices involved which a complete discussion would reveal. The point is that Congress has not considered them at all, and it would seem that they should be given attention even in the crowded legislative program, since fuel, power, and cheapened products are of paramount war importance.

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, Sept. 24, 1917.]

#### WASTED WATER POWER.

Senator WESLEY JONES is performing a service for his State, as well as for the Nation, by calling attention in the Eastern press to the need for the enactment of Federal laws under which the potential water power of the country may be developed. Two such proposed laws have practically deadlocked development for several years. The House has passed the Ferris bill, which meets the approval of many of the students of conservation and is opposed by some of the water-power developers as tending to make leasing so unattractive that capital is not likely to respond to it. The Shields bill, which has passed the Senate, gives more consideration to the lessees of power sites, and offers what is presumed to be sufficient attraction to capital to induce investments.

Senator JONES, in a two-column letter to the Brooklyn Eagle, suggests that the Shields bill will safeguard the interests of both the public and investors and urges its early enactment into law. Washington, possessing more potential and unused water power than any other State in the Union, is vitally interested in the enactment of a reasonable law and will hope that its Senator may succeed in interesting Eastern statesmen in the matter.

There are 9,700,000 water horsepower in this State requiring Federal consent before it can be utilized. Of the total, but 98,000 horsepower has been developed, and about 9,600,000 horsepower is thus going to waste. Coal is scarce and increasing in value, gas promises to be higher, power is needed for irrigation, for industries, and for transportation, and yet millions of horsepower are permitted to go to waste because statesmen can not agree as to the conditions under which it may be used.

The Shields bill is now before the Senate. It has been reported without amendment, and Senator JONES states that it will be again approved by his colleagues.

"The bill appeals to me as an orderly, masterly product of high-class statesmanship," writes Senator JONES. "It safeguards every public interest and yet its terms are fair toward those who would engage in the naturally hazardous business of water-power development."

The bill authorizes the Secretary of War to issue permits to develop water powers in navigable streams to properly qualified applicants who are, in his judgment, best qualified, in the public interest, to develop the resources; the bill provides for a permit period of 50 years, at any time after which the Government may, on two years' notice, take over the property by paying a fair value for the improvements. The bill gives the Government ample authority to conserve its interests and those of the public, and should be enacted into law.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Union-Advertiser, Sept. 20, 1917.]

#### DEVELOPMENT OF OUR WATER POWER NEEDED.

Three measures now before Congress that should be passed at the present session in the interest of the country are the Walsh and Shields bills, in the Senate, and the Small bill in the House, all looking toward

are not like the Ferris bill, to which great objection was made because it was a proposal to give over to grabbers the great wealth of water power now under the control of the Federal Government, without proper compensation to the people. These measures give the Government control over the water powers thus leased, not given, and allow the Government to regain control at the expiration of the lease. With the interests of the people in the ownership of this water power thus safeguarded, the passage of these measures is almost imperative, in view of the great need of the country.

As to the benefit of the development of the 50,000,000 of horsepower the development of the idle water power of the country. These bills now lying idle in these water rights there is no doubt. We are threatened with a serious shortage of coal, because of the great increase in our own needs and because of the needs of our allies. Our railways are struggling under the greatest load they have ever been called upon to bear. Our crops are insufficient to feed well, unless great economy be used in the distribution and consumption of them, ourselves and the rest of the world, principally our allies. If these powers be developed, the railways will be able to use them for large portions of their systems. In the first place the water-power dam would make many streams navigable for strings of barges, in this way relieving the roads of a part of their loads. In the second place, the electrification of long stretches of railways would be possible, thus doing away with the consumption of coal for hauling and releasing for other service thousands of cars, thus, in turn relieving car shortage. The power developed could be used for many industrial purposes, releasing more cars that are now used for carrying coal for these industries. Cities and towns that now have no municipal utilities or water service would be able to have them at a reasonable rate. Ten million acres of land that can not now be irrigated because they lie above the reach of gravity water can be watered and made to grow all the crops commonly raised in this country, thus increasing our food supply. We could produce all the nitrogen we need for our crops by utilizing about 12,000,000 horsepower generated by this water power, at a cost of \$580,000,000, with an increase of \$2,000,000,000 in crop production, making ourselves the food growers of the world. The saving of oil by use of these water powers in the industries would be almost as great as the saving of coal.

These are but outlines of the uses to which this water power can be put and of the advantages to the country of the development of them. The Walsh bill proposes that water powers upon nonnavigable streams within the public domain be leased by the Secretary of the Interior, while the Shields bill deals with navigable streams, the rights upon which shall be leased by the Secretary of War. The latter bill is a practically new bill, being the former Shields bill shorn of objectionable features. Provision is made in both measures for the taking over of the lease by the Government at the termination of the leasing period, with compensation for the lessee, or the extension of the lease for a second 50-year period. The Shields measure also provides for the construction of locks, booms, sluices, and other adjuncts to navigation, either at the expense of the lessees or the Government, with reciprocal compensation in either case. The States are safeguarded in their rights as to regulation of rates and taxation. The Small bill is an amendment to an existing statute and empowers the Secretary of War to enter into contracts with persons or corporations, by which the latter shall construct navigation improvements on any river or harbor in return for rights and privileges in developing, producing, and disposing of power on the streams in conformity with State laws. These contracts also run for 50 years, and provision for taking the leases over is made in the amendment. In both the Shields and Small bills the Secretary of War is empowered to sell surplus water or power to municipalities and other public corporations.

It will seem to most of us that these measures should pass at this session because of their great importance to the welfare of the people. Experts say that they will not bring us help in the war, but they will be of immense value in the commercial struggle to come after the war, and we should begin the development of these great powers at the earliest possible moment.

[From the Nassau Daily Record, Aug. 25, 1917.]

#### WATER-POWER LEGISLATION.

A bill is now pending in Congress, introduced a good while back by Senator SHIELDS, which would authorize the development of water powers throughout the West. Its terms appear to be fair. Its effect would be to utilize the vast volume of power which is going to waste every day in many parts of the country's public domain and on navigable streams.

The scarcity of paper at this time emphasizes the need of this development. Most of the unused wood-pulp supplies are close to the available water supplies. The passage of the Shields bill would therefore be a great stimulus to the paper industry and bring down the price of paper products.

That is only one of the many desirable results that would follow. With the price of fuel the highest in the history of manufacturing, the use of water power is becoming imperative; and since we have it in measureless quantities why not use it? The principles of conservation applied to timber do not apply to water powers. When timber is used it is gone. Ages are required for its renewal. But the water that passes to-day is lost forever if it is not utilized, while the use of to-day's supply does not diminish the supply of to-morrow. The only way to conserve water power is to use it.

[From Leslie's Weekly, Sept. 29, 1917.]

#### HARNESS THE STREAMS.

Of the 60,700,000 horsepower of water power in the United States all but 5,300,000 horsepower is running to waste. The water is at present locked up against utilization by the laws governing the forest reserves, the general public domain, and the navigable streams. Congressmen have not hesitated to advocate higher rates on mail matter of the second class, but have not found time to open up these water powers, so that print paper can be made cheaper for the publishers. It has been estimated by Secretary of Agriculture Houston that there is enough timber going to waste in the forest reserves and on cut-over lands to supply wood pulp indefinitely if the question of its manufacture by water power could be solved. Three bills now pending in Congress—the Shields bill, the Walsh bill, and the Small bill—are designed to release the water power to private development in the three fields mentioned. Apparently, however, it is easier to pass billion-dollar appropriations, issue bonds, and impose direct taxes on "war profits" than to harness the waters to useful purpose.



[From the Detroit (Mich.) News-Tribune, Sept. 26, 1917.]

## WASTING WATER POWERS.

At a time when conservation has been promoted to such an important place in the public mind that it has become the prime necessity for victory in the war, it is logical that the thoughts of many men should turn to the power that is going to waste every day in hundreds of streams in various parts of the country. The great obstacle in the way of harnessing these streams and forcing them to generate electricity is the fact that so many of them are under Government control, and no way has been found for permitting the Government to release them to private parties.

Coal is our chief dependence for power, and coal is now hard to get. Moreover, it is uneconomical. Water powers are permanent and need only to be controlled to furnish a great quantity of cheap electricity. It is estimated that 50,000,000 horsepower is going to waste because the law does not permit of its development. Meanwhile we worry about coal.

The Walsh bill in the Senate providing for the use of water powers included within the public domain, and the Shields bill in the Senate and the Small bill in the House relating to power development on navigable streams, have been neglected because other matters have been more pressing. Yet these bills, if too late for the war, at least relate to important steps that must be taken after the war. Without indorsing them in their entirety, the News believes that they ought to be taken up by Congress at the earliest possible moment and that the waste of potential power should be ended.

[From the Chicago News, Oct. 3, 1917.]

## HARNESS THE STREAMS—MUCH POWER IS LOST BY FAILURE TO UTILIZE RUNNING WATERS.

Of the 60,700,000 horsepower of water power in the United States, all but 5,300,000 horsepower is running to waste, Thomas F. Logan writes in Leslie's. The water is at present locked up against utilization by the laws governing the forest reserves, the general public domain, and the navigable streams. Congressmen have not hesitated to advocate higher rates on mail matter of the second class, but have not found time to open up these water powers so that print paper can be made cheaper for the publishers. It has been estimated by Secretary of Agriculture Houston that there is enough timber going to waste in the forest reserves and on cut-over lands to supply wood pulp indefinitely if the question of its manufacture by water power could be solved. Three bills now pending in Congress, the Shields bill, the Walsh bill, and the Small bill, are designed to release the water power to private development in the three fields mentioned.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Aug. 2, 1917.]

## WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT—CONGRESS STOPPED IT AND THUS FAR REFUSES TO LET IT GO ON.

A year ago, more or less, the Director of the Geological Survey estimated the potential available power which can be developed from the streams of the country at 55,000,000 horsepower. Of this but about 5,000,000 horsepower has been developed. The greater part of this power would be developed either on navigable, or alleged navigable, streams on the public domain and require the sanction of national law.

There is a law for such development, but on such terms that money can not be got for the work. The Forest Service sometimes points with pride to the number of "permits" issued, but can not point with any pride whatever to the work actually done under those permits. Such permits are usually obtained by promoters, but when they try to interest capital they fail.

There has for a long time been before Congress a bill whose provisions seem harsh enough, but which are mild compared with existing law. It is said by its promoters that under its provisions private capital can be got to develop at least the most promising projects. In what position this bill is in the present Congress we are not informed. We assume that it has been reintroduced and is somewhere on its journey to the President. Some law of this kind has been urged upon Congress by the President and the heads of the departments concerned, but Congress does nothing.

The crazy faction of those who call themselves conservationists insists that to enact any law which will make private development possible is to give away "millions" to presumably wicked and designing men.

The truth is that it is merely giving them a chance to risk their money in enterprises whose entire risks they must assume, but whose charges will be fixed by public authority.

To build the dams and install the plants is easy if you have the money. To market the current at remunerative prices is by far the greater work.

And great conserving plants will not be erected where there is danger of interruption of the power. The capital to build can not be got, or the plants to consume be erected, except upon definite legal requirements for adequate terms, and not subject to modification during their tenures, for the sources of the developed power.

When legal requirements are definite they can be accepted or rejected. But if they are indefinite, investors will not even consider them.

And meanwhile potential power in huge volumes is running to waste, and we are howling because we can not get fuel.

[From the Evansville Courier, Dec. 4, 1917.]

## PASS THE SHIELDS BILL.

While coal can not be secured to run factories, nature is supplying an enormous water power that is going to waste.

As a war measure Congress should promptly take up the Shields bill and pass it. This bill safeguards the public interest, while at the same time it makes available the unused forces of nature.

Opposition comes to it from two sources, neither of them large but both exceedingly tenacious.

On the one side are those who would exploit for their own purposes the common heritage of all. On the other are the I. W. W. conservationists of the Gifford Pinchot brand, whose radical ideas amount to practical disuse of the national resources.

The Shields bill is a conservative measure. It neither gives away the national ownership in the streams nor locks them up away from public use. In this need of utilizing all our resources, certainly the forces of nature should be put to work. The Shields bill will do this if it can be enacted into law.

[From the Pittsburgh Leader, Oct. 8, 1917.]

## SHIELDS WATER-POWER BILL.

Senator John K. Shields has introduced a bill in the United States Senate providing for the financing of water-power development. There has been an almost inexcusable indifference on the part of the Government in making effective the great water-power resources of this country. Water power is a cheap and highly efficient power. If there was ever a time in the history of the Nation when water power should be developed, that time is now.

The great unused stands of pulp-wood timber that are now controlled by the present paper makers are almost without exception in sections of the country where the available water powers lie, either in the public domain or on navigable streams. Power is absolutely essential to the conversion of wood into pulp and water power is the most logical power.

The Senate of the United States can strike effectively at the heart of the Paper Trust if it passes effective water-power legislation. The people of the country should get actively behind the Shields bill and urge its passage.

The paper combine that has so arrogantly defied the Government in its price manipulation will naturally oppose the Shields bill. This fact should make the people rally to its support.

## WATER-POWER LEGISLATION.

There are two classes of water powers requiring Federal authority for development. One class is located in the public domain, and only temporary or revocable authority for development can be granted by the Departments of the Interior and of Agriculture; the other class is located in the navigable streams, and no statutory authority exists for granting permits for development, Congress thus far having reserved to itself alone the right to grant such permits.

## PUBLIC-DOMAIN LEGISLATION.

Federal control of water-power development and its electrical transmission where public lands are involved is based upon the constitutional right of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States. The Federal Government holds its lands both as sovereign and proprietor. As proprietor the United States has all the privileges of the private owner, all the benefits arising from State laws, all the appurtenances which the lands of any other owner may have, and yet as sovereign its lands are not subject to State taxation or condemnation. Federal control of water-power development on non-navigable streams rests solely on its ownership of such public lands as are required for emplacement of power houses, flumes, conduits, and transmission lines, or which would be overflowed as a result of construction of dams. Thus Congress may prevent the development of water powers in the public domain either by withdrawing the dam sites from entry or withholding the right to use them altogether, or by enactment of restrictive laws under which capital can not safely invest. The Supreme Court has recently held that the act of February 15, 1901, relating to the use of public lands for electrical and other purposes, is exclusively controlling in respect to hydroelectric development in the public domain. Capital can not be obtained for important developments under this act, which authorizes a revocable permit only, and all unite in the opinion that it should be amended or replaced by a new act dealing with the subject.

The Public Lands Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives have been considering the question for the past four years, and have had hearings at which the subject has been exhaustively considered from every standpoint. Bills have been introduced, one of which passed the House but failed to pass the Senate. A skeleton basis has been arrived at satisfactory to a majority of Congress, and it only remains to agree upon some of the details.

Senate bill 2399, introduced by Senator WALSH June 5, 1917, provides a workable measure, fair alike to the public interest and to the investor, and which, if passed in its present form, would immediately result in the development of many of the water powers contained in the public domain.

## SUMMARY OF THE WALSH BILL.

This bill is now before the Senate Public Lands Committee. It authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to issue 50-year permits to States, municipalities, corporations, or individuals, for the use of public lands necessary to power development. It requires "the diligent, orderly, and reasonable development and continuous operation of the water power, subject to market conditions." It provides for the regulation of rates and service by State authorities where the business is intrastate and by the Interstate Commerce Commission where the business is interstate. It gives the United States the right to take over the property, including contracts entered into with the approval of public authorities, for itself or for a new permittee, at any time after 50 years upon three years' notice upon paying the amount fixed by the public authorities as the value of the property for rate-making purposes and upon assuming the contracts, the amount to be paid not to include "any public lands, rights of way, franchises, or other property occupied or granted under this act by the United States, or by the good will or prospective revenues." It provides for forfeiture of the permit for noncompliance with its terms and authorizes the Secretary of the Interior "to make such general rules and regulations as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying the provisions of the act into full force and effect." The Secretary is authorized to examine the books and accounts of permittees and to require them to submit statements regarding every detail of their business. The Secretary is also authorized to "specify in the permit and to collect charges for all land occupied," and of the proceeds one-half is to be paid to the State within which the power plant is located and the remaining one-half into the national reclamation fund. The bill provides that no charge shall be made for the use of public lands for power purposes to States or municipalities, or where the power is to be used in connection with the utilization of the timber resources of the national forests, or where the power development does not exceed 25 horsepower.

## NAVIGABLE-STREAM LEGISLATION.

By provisions in the river and harbor acts of 1890 and 1899 Congress has prohibited the placing of dams in navigable streams without the consent of Congress in each case. No executive officer or department has power to grant the necessary authority, unless the stream lies wholly within a single State, in which case the State legislature may grant the authority, subject to approval of plans by the Secretary of War. As navigable streams almost invariably touch or traverse more than one State the exception is unimportant.

For more than 10 years Congress has refused to grant authority for hydroelectric development in navigable streams except in compliance with a general statute, known as the general dam act, enacted



in 1906 and amended in 1910. This act provides such restrictive terms and conditions that with but two small exceptions no power developments and river improvements have been made by private capital upon navigable streams since 1912, and developments are prevented and held back aggregating 2,000,000 horsepower, and which would open 1,100 miles of additional inland waterways to navigation through investment of private capital and without taxation or appropriation of public moneys.

Among the conditions imposed by this general act with which it is unsafe and impossible for capital to comply is the requirement that the Secretary of War may "at any time" during the life of the permit require the installation of locks, which would make the amount to be invested always uncertain.

It also provides that the permit shall "fix such charge or charges for the privilege granted as may be sufficient to restore conditions with respect to navigability as existing at the time such privilege be granted or reimburse the United States for doing same"; thus the permittee would have to pay charges impossible of determination in advance, and perhaps even would be compelled to furnish the money necessary to destroy his own plant. The act also specifically provides that "the United States shall incur no liability for the alteration, amendment, or repeal thereof to the owner or owners or any other persons interested in any dam which shall have been constructed in accordance with its provisions." Of course the United States should incur no liability in connection with the possible amendment or repeal of this act, but property created under the act should be protected from impairment through such amendment or repeal, and this the present law fails to do. The act also provides "that the authority granted under or in pursuance of the provisions of this act shall terminate at the end of a period not to exceed 50 years from the date of the original approval of the project under this act, unless sooner revoked as herein provided." This would leave the permittee with the property on his hands at the end of 50 years, with no authority to operate it, and his status would be that of a trespasser.

No responsible banker, trustee, or business man would invest a dollar upon the security afforded by such a permit.

During the last Congress the Senate, after five weeks of careful consideration, by a vote of 46 to 22, passed what was known as "the Shields general dam bill," which corrected the defects of the general law and authorized the Secretary of War to issue permits when river improvements could be secured thereby. This bill was referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which amended it, and with still further amendments by the House it was passed and sent to conference in June, 1916. It remained in conference eight months and died there when the Sixty-fourth Congress adjourned March 4, 1917.

The Shields general dam bill has been reintroduced in the Senate by Senator SHIELDS as S. 14, and is before the Commerce Committee. A bill (H. R. 4504) providing for the extension of inland waterways and the incidental development of water power by private capital has been introduced in the H. R. by Mr. SMALL and is now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

It should not be difficult for Congress to agree upon a workable general dam act of a nature under which permits could be issued by proper executive authority and under which development capital could be obtained. A bill which would provide, as does the Walsh public-domain water-power bill, above referred to, for a permit tenure of 50 years with the right to the Government to purchase the property at the end of the permit period, or at any time thereafter, upon paying just compensation therefor, based upon the value of the property as fixed by the public authorities for rate-making purposes, would be fair and workable. Service and rates should be under the supervision of the public authorities. The permits should also provide for the installation of locks by the permittee if required by the Secretary of War in the original permit at a specified time; for reimbursement to the United States for expense of investigation and supervision; fishways and signals to be installed by the permittee, and power for operation of locks to be furnished by him free of cost. The permit should also contain a cancellation clause in case of noncompliance with its terms and such other reasonable rules and regulations as might be necessary to safeguard the public interests.

In case facilities are not adequately utilized by the permittee other persons may be allowed to develop them, with due regard to his interests.

State laws regarding distribution of water are to be observed in all permits, and there is provision for the determining by Federal courts of what particular rights, if any, the States of Colorado and New Mexico have in the Rio Grande.

The Shields and Myers bills, which sought to bring about this result last year, were vigorously opposed by Gifford Pinchot and his school of conservationists. Perhaps the one of their many arguments which attracted most attention was that the grant would in practice be perpetual. Advocates of the bill, however, maintained that there was nothing in it which forbade the Government to condemn a plant and take it over, paying just compensation, in case there were valid reasons for doing so; and contended that the fear that it would never be possible to get the case out of the courts involved fundamental distrust of the Federal judicial system.

The bills were not brought to fruition last year for many reasons, chief of which, apparently, was the pressure of other legislation necessitated by the preparedness program and the military operations on the Mexican border. And the detail in which the development of water power most acutely touched the question of preparedness was settled by the passage of the law appropriating \$20,000,000 for a Federal nitrate plant.

The development of the industry of extracting nitrogen from the air by powerful electric motors has gone furthest in Germany, where the serious results of dependence on foreign nitrates for essential components of high explosives was realized long before the war. The world's greatest and in fact almost sole supply of natural nitrates have come from the great deposits in the Chilean Provinces conquered from Bolivia and Peru in the war of 1879. To the Germans, faced with the possibility of war with a superior naval power, it became evident that this supply probably would be cut off at once, and that it would be necessary to provide a substitute for the nitrogen which was essential in the manufacture of munitions.

Scandinavian processes providing for the fixing of the loose nitrogen in the air had been developed, but had not been found of great commercial value in competition with the Chilean product. The Germans set up huge electric generators run by water power and used these processes to lay in a supply of nitrates which averaged a commercial value of 60 per cent, as against 12 per cent of valuable matter in the Chilean mineral.

Meanwhile the shortage of shipping, the possibility of the exhaustion of the Chilean fields, and the necessity in any case of a long voyage up the western coast of the American continent made American officials realize the necessity of providing in this country some substitute for the Chilean mineral, and the discussion of this brought out the great value of water power in establishing suitable plants for the fixing of nitrogen. But this is only one of the many ways in which the enormous waste of water power is reducing the efficiency of the United States.

Nitrates are essential in fertilizer no less than in ammunition making. The low acreage of American crops in most districts is attributed very largely by agricultural experts to the lack of fertilizer, or rather to the American habit of using insufficient fertilizer. In 1911 this country, according to a bulletin issued recently by the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, used 23 pounds of fertilizer per acre of improved land; Great Britain used 152; Germany, 214; and Belgium, 448.

The report of the German department of agriculture for 1913, according to the same authority, showed that 2,000,000 tons of fertilizer had resulted in increasing crops by 63,000,000 tons. "The German farmer," says the pamphlet, "practically used his land as an agent for transforming fertilizer into product, while the American farmer tries to get products out of his starving land without feeding it sufficient plant food."

Phosphates are numerous enough in America, and with the cutting off of the German supplies of potash chemical invention has made large potash deposits in America and Canada workable for the first time. But nitrogen must come either from Chile or the air, and with extensive water-power electric plants many people believe it can be obtained more cheaply, as well as more certainly, from the air.

The Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul is driving its transcontinental trains across the Rockies under electric power obtained from hydro-electric plants. For 450 miles, from Harlowton, Mont., to Avery, Idaho, the main line has been electrified, and the process is being extended to Seattle, 500 miles farther west. John D. Ryan, president of the Montana Power Co., has said that the price of electric power is less than one-third of the cost of the coal for operation over the same line, and that, in addition, one-third of the road's freight cars, used in hauling coal from its own mines for its own uses, had been freed. The Butte, Anaconda & Pacific has also electrified 80 miles of its line, again at a saving of two-thirds of the cost of coal.

The States where most of the water power of the country can be developed are also the ones where there is most lumber available for the manufacture of wood pulp. If the water power is unlocked, electric plants for the manufacture of paper can be built close to the lumber supply and paper provided far more cheaply, than is now possible. At present great quantities of pulp are being imported from Canada, and were imported from Norway and Sweden until recently, these being countries which allow more development, both of forests and of water power, than the United States. Indeed, one of the most ominous results of the present policy of forbidding the development of water power in this country has been the building of plants in Norway and Canada by American power companies, which were unable to extend their facilities at home.

A valuable by-product of the development of water power on streams now classed, in the somewhat optimistic terminology of the Government, as "navigable," but which require constant appropriations for a long time before much effect is visible, is expected to be the rendering of stretches of them actually navigable by the construction of dams for the gathering of water. It has been estimated that long stretches of inland waterways which would otherwise need much expenditure of Government money before they would float vessels of any importance can be opened up by this incidental effect of private enterprise.

And this touches upon perhaps the most important phase of water-power development—the conservation of fuel.

Since the Shields and Myers bills were discussed in Congress the United States has entered upon a great war, a war which will probably be won or lost by the success of America and her allies in solving the problem of transportation. Ships are the first essential, but adequate handling of commerce in the United States is of very great importance. Many of the supplies which we are shipping to Europe have to be carried a great distance across the country. This causes a high strain on the railroads, an almost constant shortage of freight cars, and resultant difficulty in handling shipments of goods which disarranges internal trade and leads to prolonged delays and difficulties.

The development of internal waterways suggested above would take at least some of the burden of freight transportation off the railroads. The utilization of water power in the production of energy would save enormous quantities of coal which could be used to meet the needs of France and Italy, and to supply the new ships which all the allied countries are building. And the electrification of railroads would not only save coal but would release the large numbers of coal cars now required to carry fuel not only for the roads themselves but for industries which could be operated by water power as well. In a struggle which necessitates intensive development of the Nation which is to win, this country can not afford to let an enormous source of energy go to waste.

#### RESOLUTIONS ON DEVELOPMENT OF WATER POWERS.

##### AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS' ASSOCIATION.

At the convention of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, held in Washington, D. C., June 21, 1917, the following resolutions urging the passage of water-power bills were adopted, and copies thereof have been delivered to the President and other officials of the Government:

"Whereas the paper committee, in its efforts to secure relief from the constantly increasing tension of the news-print situation, has ascertained from Government and other reliable sources that there are no undeveloped water powers of satisfactory size and location remaining in the United States which do not lie partially or wholly within the public domain or upon navigable streams; and

"Whereas under the existing laws relating to the development and use of water powers in the public domain, as interpreted by the United States Supreme Court in its decision rendered in the Utah Power case, it has been found impossible to interest capital in further water-power developments, and as a result no new developments are being made; and

"Whereas under existing conditions the paper committee has not found it possible to develop sufficient new tonnage within the United States adequately to increase the supply of news-print paper until these water powers can be developed; and

"Whereas it is imperative that action be taken in this matter at this session of Congress if the present and increasingly acute situation is to be relieved; and



"Whereas it appears to be in the interest of general preparedness and the national defense that the water powers of the United States should be made available in order that they may be utilized, thus conserving man power and coal resources and making possible the quicker and more complete development of our natural resources; and

"Whereas Senate bill No. 2399 has been introduced in the United States Senate by Senator WALSH, and House bill No. 4504 has been introduced in the House by Representative SMALL, and these bills as introduced provide the remedies necessary to afford the desired relief and give adequate protection to the public: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That it is the sense of the members of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association in convention assembled, at Washington, D. C., June 21, 1917, that this legislation be, and hereby is, indorsed, and its prompt passage is strongly advocated as emergency measures, and, further, that all members of the association and other publishers be urged to support and indorse the aforesaid bills and urge their passage at the present session of Congress: And be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and other officials of the Government and to all members of this association."

#### SOUTHERN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS' ASSOCIATION.

The necessity of immediate development of water powers was discussed at the fifteenth annual convention of the Southern Newspaper Publishers' Association, held at Asheville, N. C., July 9, 10, and 11, 1917, and the following resolutions passed:

"Resolved, That the Southern Newspaper Publishers' Association, representing 105 leading daily newspapers of the South, in convention assembled, unanimously indorses and urges the adoption of the plans for the release and development of the water power of our country as proposed in the Walsh bill in the Senate and the Small bill in the House. We believe that the adoption of such measures insures the development of our country along industrial lines, and especially do they promise relief to the newspapers of the country from the oppressive condition brought about by the news-print manufacturers' trust."

#### SHIELDS BILL UNANIMOUSLY REPORTED.

Since the above resolutions were adopted Senator SHIELDS, of Tennessee, has introduced Senate bill 1419, which provides for the unlocking of water-power opportunities in navigable streams. The bill fully protects the public interests and at the same time safeguards the investment sufficiently to attract private capital for development purposes. The bill has been unanimously and favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Commerce and is at present on the Senate Calendar awaiting the action of the Senate.

[From the San Francisco Journal of Commerce, Aug. 16, 1917.]

#### 50,000,000 OF HORSEPOWER RUNNING TO WASTE.

Once again a movement is gathering force to utilize the more than 50,000,000 of horsepower that is running to waste in American streams. Four-fifths of the possible electric energy that could be developed from water power in this country must be developed on lands belonging to the Federal Government, which are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, or on navigable streams, which are controlled by the Secretary of War. The agitation in favor of conservation of natural resources resulted in restrictions so severe that resources were not only conserved but reserved. Present laws permitting the utilization of these sites for hydroelectric plants provide that any permit is revocable at the pleasure of the Federal department concerned, and the possibility of this summary action has tended to scare capital away.

Last year a determined movement was made to pass laws which should offer opportunities to capital to develop this water power under Federal control. The Shields bill, which passed the Senate, and the Myers bill, which passed the House, established practically identical regulations respectively for navigable streams and for public lands, but neither was enacted into law. Last month Senator THOMAS F. WALSH, of Montana, introduced a bill into the Senate which embodies most of last year's Myers bill, and legislation to cover the navigable streams is to be introduced into the House.

The Shields and Myers bills were vigorously opposed by Gifford Pinchot and his school of conservationists. Perhaps the one of their many arguments which attracted most attention was that the grant would in practice be perpetual. Advocates of the bill, however, maintained that there was nothing in it which forbade the Government to condemn a plant and take it over, paying just compensation in case there was valid reason for doing so, and contended that the fear that it would never be possible to get the case out of the courts involved fundamental distrust of the Federal judicial system.

The bills were not brought to fruition last year for many reasons, chief of which, apparently, was the pressure of other legislation necessitated by the preparedness program and the military operations on the Mexican border.

[From the Kennebec Journal, Augusta, Me., Dec. 7, 1917.]

#### WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

In his address to Congress on Tuesday President Wilson said: "It is imperatively necessary that the consideration of the full use of the water power of the country and also the consideration of the systematic and yet economical development of such of the national resources of the country as are still under control of the Federal Government should be resumed and affirmatively and constructively dealt with at the earliest possible moment. The pressing need of such legislation is daily becoming more obvious."

It is clear that if the water powers of the country are to be developed legislation must be passed under which financing will be possible. There are now pending in the United States Senate the so-called Shields bill, and favorably reported by the Committee on Commerce to the Senate, and also the Walsh bill before the Public Lands Committee in the Senate. Similar bills have also been introduced in the Senate by MYERS and in the House by Congressman SMALL. The Shields bill authorizes the Secretary of War, under certain conditions, to grant permits for water-power development in navigable streams; while the Walsh bill authorizes the issuance of Government permits for water-power development at sites on the public domain. Both these bills have many friends among legislators and among investors, who stand ready to develop the water power if given such permits.

The thing that has held up water-power development for a long time, as we understand it, is the more or less imaginary difference between the ultraconservationists and more practical men of affairs, who believe that the first thing to do in developing water powers is to go ahead and develop them. The party of the first part, standing as the high defender of the people's rights, fears any movement toward development will result in somebody making a profit out of the venture. On the other hand, the party of the second part insists with good logic, and thus far have the passing of events to prove, that unless investment is made profitable under Government control it will not invest, and that if the people themselves are waited for to develop the vast water powers now lying undeveloped by planning and authorizing a system of public expenditure and development the thing will be a long time coming.

The American Newspaper Publishers' Association has been dealing largely with this subject for months, and has distributed volumes of information bearing upon all branches of the subject. In a recent special bulletin a chapter is devoted to showing that Mr. Gifford Pinchot's claimed differences with the bills now pending in Congress are all reconcilable with the bills themselves, and that actually no difference exists, except in the wording between the demands for development "of public water powers on terms fair to the public" and the Shields bill, which retains Federal control over the dam sites, which are to be "held in public hands," their use only being permitted for a limited term of years by private parties.

Perhaps the President's recommendation, with the knowledge that has been attained by Congress in recent months, will start the ball to rolling toward actual development of the country's immense, wondrously valuable and available water powers. Perhaps the Shields or the Walsh bill may be so amended as to meet all the requirements insisted upon by Mr. Pinchot or others who constitute themselves as knights in armor for the public welfare.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 16, 1917.]

#### UTILIZING WATER POWER.

Within the short time that it has been in session the Senate already has enacted one very important piece of legislation. This is the water-power development bill, which authorizes the construction of dams in navigable streams by private parties for the development of power. It is estimated by the United States Geological Survey that under this bill, if developed to the practicable maximum without resorting to storage, nearly 62,000,000 potential horsepower can be generated. If the storage system is used, it is believed that this amount can be increased to 200,000,000 horsepower.

Experienced Senators frankly admit that Congress is very tardy in making this reasonable provision for the development of natural resources, but they are ready now to go ahead in an endeavor to make amends for the delay. Not only can this immense horsepower be produced, but it is stated that if this bill is enacted into law over 10,000,000 horsepower could be produced from dams installed in connection with the improvement of inland waterways. By the installation of locks in the power dams, over 4,000 miles of the upper reaches of these rivers would be opened to navigation.

Under the provisions of the bill the Secretary of War is authorized to issue grants to private parties for the construction of power dams in navigable rivers under terms and regulations which will safeguard the public interests and the capital invested. Rates and service are to be regulated by State authorities, or by Federal authorities if the grantee does an interstate business.

During the debate on the measure it was pointed out that not only would the power thus produced be of great benefit to the manufacturing interests of the country, but it would result in the conservation of coal and oil, and that other advantages would accrue. That the legislation is beneficent, if belated, can not be doubted. It is not strange that the public should wonder why this great source of power should have been neglected all these years. But the important thing is that Congress has awakened to the situation, no doubt because of the trouble and hardship the country is experiencing with a shortage of fuel. It is to be hoped that within a brief time the rivers will be put to work for the good of the people.

[From the Electrical World, Sept. 29, 1917.]

#### THE PENALTY OF SLOTH.

Over and over again we have dinned into the ears of the public the almost criminal negligence of permitting the water powers of the country to remain unutilized in face of the crying needs of industry and the certainty that the Nation's supply of fuel must be conserved. And yet, despite the absolute certainty that unused water represents an irremediable loss of energy, in spite of steadily rising costs of fuel and of everything in which fuel prices figure, the legislative authorities have dawdled along, pulled one way and another by contrary currents of politics, beset by the pleadings of general interests, of special interests, and no interests at all until the time has come when the penalty of delay is enforced by fate against the unready. It is difficult to speak with patience of the many attempts which have been made to obtain opportunity to develop water powers on a fair and permanent basis; and now the country needs the power, the mines are short of labor, the railroads are gorged with traffic, the coastwise shipping has been drafted into trans-Atlantic service, and industrial plants already are beginning to shut down for lack of fuel.

The full development of the country's hydraulic resources can not supersede in any full sense the use of fuel, but it can prevent the shortage of fuel being disastrously felt even in time of stress like this. The long and short of the matter is that war conditions have forced upon us a fuel situation which normally might not have been reached for a couple of centuries, and absolutely nothing is being done as yet to put an end to the water-power deadlock. This deadlock is largely due to timid Congressmen, whose socialistically inclined constituents are terrified by the boggy man of monopoly shaken in their faces by demagogues. There is no such thing possible as monopoly of water power under the powers of regulation possessed by our Government. There has been plenty of capital all along ready to go into any transmission enterprise that promised reasonable profit, asking only that some tenure of life should be granted to its efforts, and that it should not at the end of a few years be robbed of the results of its endeavor. All these things ought to be sufficiently self-evident to those who have watched the progress of the attempts at water-power legislation. Everything has been held up by unreasonable and indefensible projects of regulation so drastic in their nature as to frighten off any sane investor. Millions upon millions of horsepower therefore stay unutilized. The time has come when the country wants them.



The next year will probably see these United States transformed into a prodigious munitions plant, and every branch of industry which can tend to successful carrying on of the war now in hand must be pushed to its utmost capacity. At such a crisis it is not pleasant to find the Niagara power tied up, largely for sentimental reasons, by needless restrictions and to realize that at any time Canada, also busy with war industries, may stop the exportation of its Niagara power. If inaction continues much longer, the natural result will be to drive the large power-consuming industries, particularly the electrochemical ones, into Canadian territory, where they may by chance find a kinder welcome than has been extended to them on the American side of the falls. The grimmest thing about the whole situation is that it has developed so swiftly as to give no time even for the most willing efforts to furnish prompt relief. It is no quick or easy job to bring a hydroelectric plant of 100,000 horsepower or so into productive activity, and time is the one thing which money can not buy. There is chatter in newspapers about the conservation of coal and oil. No single stroke would have gone so far toward bringing this about as a proper hydroelectric law enacted two years or more ago. It is already far too late to reap in time for the exigencies of war industries the full advantage which the country has in its water powers. The most that can be hoped for now is that if Congress gives relief swiftly some substantial portion of the work may be accomplished let us say within the next year, in time for the succeeding campaigns. Of the other millions of available horsepower, some are beyond hope of quick redemption and others can be brought into action in two or three years. Rapid and complete development of everything capable of it is the first and immediate step to be taken, leaving the fuller working up of the situation for later efforts. Another six months will show with terrible force the foolishness of delays in the past. Let us have no more of them.

[From the Electrical Review, Sept. 1, 1917.]

#### WATER-POWER BILLS AND THEIR RELATION TO EACH OTHER.

Relative to pending water-power legislation there is constant need of keeping before the public certain basic facts in clear outline. If the way is to be opened for developing the Nation's water-power resources it must be through the enactment of laws, such as are proposed in bills now before Congress or others of similar import. The provisions in the bills referred to and their relations to each other should be clearly understood. If they have any serious defects or are fundamentally wrong in any respect from the standpoint of either the investor or the public, necessary changes should be made. If no such defects or unfair provisions exist, an effort should be made to concentrate all proper influences in their support.

The provisions of the Walsh bill have been previously explained in these columns. This is a Senate measure, now before Congress, which provides for the leasing of water-power sites on streams within the public domain, under authority of the Secretary of the Interior. The control of proposed projects under such leases is applicable only to nonnavigable streams. Senate bill No. 1419, changed as to certain features and reintroduced last April by Senator SHIELDS, provides in a quite similar manner for power development on navigable waters, but under authority of the Secretary of War, because the control of navigation channels comes within the scope of his department. The Shields bill proposes amendments to an act approved June 23, 1910, which relates to the construction of dams across navigable waters. A fact which should be kept clearly in mind is that the Walsh bill and Shields bill pertain to different departments of the Government, and that both are essential to the inauguration of a broad national policy of water-power development. Each measure would be workable independently of the other, but viewed in the light of nation-wide demands they may be considered supplementary to each other. The need of the hour is for a policy that will remove the obstructions and restrictions, so that our water-power resources may be available as soon as possible. Both bills seem to safeguard public interest and should be enacted into laws primarily as industrial measures, incidentally as war measures.

The Shields bill provisions with respect to terms of lease and regulations concerning the disposition of the project at the end of the 50-year period are nearly similar to those in the Walsh bill. In either case the Federal Government may take over the project, after properly remunerating the lessee, or may grant him a permit for a second term, or may recognize the transfer of the project to a third party. But under the terms of the Shields bill the Secretary of War may stipulate a number of other conditions in the 50-year permit. One of these is to require the permittee to construct locks, booms, sluices, and other structures for navigation purposes, without cost to the Government, and to supply power free of charge for operating locks and accessory equipment. Another stipulation may be that if navigation improvements are not made a part of the lease the Government may construct locks and other facilities, and grantee shall furnish free power and right of way required, and shall pay the Government reasonable charges for benefits accruing on account of headwater and storage-reservoir improvements. Throughout, the Shields bill recognizes the rights and authority of the State government to regulate rates of service for power produced and distributed by the party to whom the permit is granted; but in the case of an interstate service, in which State authorities do not agree, the Interstate Commerce Commission may assume jurisdiction, and all property embraced in the project of permittee is made subject to taxation by the State in which the service is rendered. In case of any dam built or taken over by the Federal Government, the Secretary of War may lease surplus water to municipalities or other public corporations for power purposes or water service.

House bill No. 4504, introduced in May, 1917, by Representative SMALL, is in the hands of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This bill is amendatory of a section of the rivers and harbors act approved March 3, 1899. The Small amendment simply extends the scope of an existing statute by authorizing the Secretary of War to enter into a contract with any person or corporation who shall undertake to construct navigation improvements on any river or harbor in return for rights and privileges in developing, producing, and disposing of power on said streams in conformity with the laws of the State in which the project is situated. The terms of such proposed contracts are to run 50 years, at the termination of which the Government may elect to take over the improvement and projects, on the repayment to the contractor the amount of his investment. This bill further so amends the act as to authorize the Secretary of War to lease surplus water at dams constructed by the Government in the interest of navigation to parties who propose to generate power, preference being given to municipalities or other public corporations.

[From the Hannibal (Mo.) Post, Apr. 3, 1917.]

#### FOOD AND WATER POWER.

The close association between food supply and water power was carefully defined by Herbert Myrick before the Southern Commercial Congress, which met in 1916 at Norfolk. The fact, apparent to-day, that the coming winter is going to see a scarcity of food such as has not been known in recent history makes Mr. Myrick's conclusions all the more important. He said:

"The food problem will not be wholly solved and the fullest agricultural and industrial development will not come to the American people until the Mississippi River is harnessed so that the millions of acres in that valley now overflowed or subject to inundation are made safe to the plow and profitable to the farmer.

"This can be done only by means of the spillway project supplementing the levee system. This will transform the Mississippi into a series of lakes, each with uniform height of water the year around. The river then may be straightened by canalizing across its bends. Navigation will be unimpeded.

"The dams by which the water is stepped down the total fall of 350 feet from above Cairo to below New Orleans may generate 5,000,000 horsepower at mean low water. Transformed into hydroelectricity, it will furnish cheap heat, light, and power for 800 miles either side of the river. A deep waterway from St. Louis to Chicago, with the improvement of the river from St. Louis to St. Paul, will open the interior States to the cheapest transportation. The spillway carries off the flood waters, provides drainage, and furnishes irrigation where and as needed. The project as a whole is the grandest of engineering conceptions, yet can be carried out in such a way as to more than pay for itself.

"Cheaper money and cheaper fertilizers must accompany more knowledge of agricultural science, more economy in agricultural practice, more energy among farmers, more patriotic devotion to ideals of service to State and Nation."

[From the Springfield (Ill.) State-Register, Aug. 14, 1917.]

#### THE SHIELDS WATER-POWER BILL.

Senator JOHN K. SHIELDS has introduced a bill in the United States Senate providing for the financing of water-power development. There has been an almost inexcusable indifference on the part of the Government in making effective the great water-power resources of this country. Water power is a cheap and highly efficient power. If there was ever a time in the history of the Nation when water power should be developed that time is now.

The great unused stands of pulp-wood timber that are now controlled by the present paper makers are almost without exception in sections of the country where the available water powers lie, either in the public domain or on navigable streams. Power is absolutely essential to the conversion of wood into pulp and water power is the most logical power.

The Senate of the United States can strike effectively at the heart of the Paper Trust if it passes effective water-power legislation. The people of the country should get actively behind the Shields bill and urge its passage.

The paper combine that has so arrogantly defied the Government in its price manipulation will naturally oppose the Shields bill. This fact should make the people rally to its support.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer, Aug. 24, 1917.]

#### WATER-POWER BILLS INDORSED BY CHAMBER.

Support of pending legislation for the development of water-power sites was urged in telegrams forwarded yesterday to the members of the Washington delegation in Congress by President Albert J. Rhodes, of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce and Commercial Club.

The telegram of President Rhodes, who recently called a special meeting of the trustees to urge immediate development of water-power sites as a war necessity, follows:

"The Seattle Chamber of Commerce and Commercial Club indorses Shields Senate bill, No. 1419; Small House bill, No. 4504, providing for development of water power on navigable streams; and Walsh Senate bill, No. 2393, providing for development of water power in public domains, and earnestly urges you to give your active support to each of these measures, as they are vitally important as emergency war legislation and equally important to the people of this State, and should, in the opinion of this chamber, be passed at this session of Congress without fail."

[From the Decatur (Ill.) Review, Aug. 18, 1917.]

#### A MUCH-NEEDED LAW.

Senator JOHN K. SHIELDS, of Tennessee, has recently introduced a bill in the United States Senate relating to water power on navigable streams, which is one of the wisest, most needed, and valuable pieces of legislation which has been brought before that body for consideration at the present session. It is a bill which is not only in the interest of the general public, but also interests especially every newspaper publisher and user of paper made from wood pulp in the United States.

There are few well-informed persons who do not know of the extortions put upon newspapers and paper users during the last two years by paper manufacturers through illegal combinations, for which seven of their prominent officials are now under indictment. They have been able to do this through their control of pulp-wood timber, which they have obtained wherever they could make it available. The great unused stands of pulp-wood timber that are not controlled by the present paper makers are almost without exception in sections of the country where the available water power lies either in the public domain or in navigable streams. As power is absolutely essential in the conversion of wood into pulp, it is obvious that laws should be passed which will permit financing water-power developments and making them available for the manufacture of paper.

It is this which the bill of Senator SHIELDS seeks to do, and its provisions are amply justified by the necessities of the Nation. There is urgent need that this measure should be passed at the present session of Congress and there appears to be no good reason why its passage should not be hastened and it should not receive the unanimous support of both branches of Congress. The measure is not sectional or partisan, is in no way objectionable and is in the public interest.

Unless this measure and others looking in the same direction are now passed no one can predict the limit to which the extortion of paper manufacturers may not go.



[From the New York Evening Post, Sept. 15, 1917.]

**LAW IS URGED TO OPEN UP WATER POWER—HYDROELECTRIC DEVELOPMENT MIGHT RELEASE 740,000 MEN—35,000,000 WATER HORSEPOWER WASTED ANNUALLY IN THE UNITED STATES—LEGISLATION BEFORE CONGRESS.**

Legislation to open water-power development to private capital and investment is being urged at this session of Congress. What amounts to a Nation-wide protest is being made by industrial enterprises on behalf of the 35,000,000 water horsepower estimated by the Secretary of the Interior, Franklin K. Lane, as annually wasted in the United States. It is believed by many that the laws governing public domain and navigable rivers are responsible for this condition.

Reform measures have already been drafted. There is a bill before the Senate Public Lands Committee, introduced by Senator WALSH on June 5 of this year, designed to offer to enterprise on Government land a secure and definite tenure of lease such as is required in any line of business development. Another bill introduced by Mr. SMALL and pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, provides for the development of water power in navigable rivers by private capital. In view of the demands made upon this country by the war it is felt that measures aiming to release the vast productive power latent in hydroelectric power should be promptly adopted.

Under existing statutes capital has not interested itself in development of water power on Government domain for the reason that the only permit issued for the location of power plants is revocable at the will of the Secretary of State, and no sure provision is made for just compensation when the permit is revoked. As for the 2,000,000 horsepower represented by the navigable rivers of the country, the general dam act of 1906 is so uncertain in the clause reserving the right to demand restoration of "navigability" that business men, according to the report of a prominent bond-selling house in this city, have considered it as an unsound security for the investment of funds.

Figures taken from the Geological Survey show that 77 per cent of the total potential water horsepower of the United States is so located as to require Federal permits. The significance of this fact is seen from the following statistics: Of the 46,913,200 water horsepower in the country requiring Federal permits, 3.9 per cent is developed, while of the 13,800,000 not requiring Federal permits, 25.2 per cent is developed.

Business men familiar with European affairs say that the policy of our Government toward the development of its water horsepower resources is far behind the attitude of Norway, Sweden, Germany, and Canada. American power companies, unable to extend their facilities at home, have been driven abroad. Products which exist in greater quantities here than in European countries, but which depend upon the extension of hydroelectric power for their manufacture—wood pulp, for instance—have been imported from across the ocean. In particular, the manufacture of nitrogen for fertilizer, obtainable by a recent process from the atmosphere by means of the electric arc, is claiming a million hydroelectric horsepower abroad and not many in the United States.

The war has called public attention to many needs. Since America became the supply market for world consumption the demand upon her productive power has been enormously increased. In addition, she is planning to put many soldiers in the field, and the impairment of her industrial man power is regarded as being serious and a menace to future development.

Figures for the last four years show that the total immigration for 1915, 1916, and 1917 has been only 920,929, or 292,551 less than for the single year ending June 30, 1914. For the past 25 years there has been an annual addition to our population of nearly 1,000,000 foreigners. It has been predicted that the warring nations, whose manhood has been decimated, will keep their labor at home after the war by the passing of stringent legislation. In view of this condition, it is felt that if America is to remain a manufacturing and exporting Nation, her man power must be put on an efficient basis.

In an article in the Electrical World for June 23, 1917, entitled "Why hydroelectric development lags," Hugh L. Cooper has treated statistically the release in man power, coal tonnage, railway facilities, and capital that would result from the utilization of the water horsepower wasted in the United States. He estimates that 740,000 men would be released for other industries or for agriculture if 35,000,000 horsepower for one year were developed hydroelectrically instead of by the equivalent process of coal combustion. Every 50 horsepower developed hydroelectrically releases one man. The change would further effect a saving of 280,000,000 tons of coal and 600,000 freight cars necessary to haul the coal—or four times the number needed to supply the freight-car shortage of March, 1917. It is as roundabout, he declares, to haul millions of tons of coal unnecessarily as it would be to evaporate salt water shipped to the interior instead of using the inland salt deposits.

Summing up the financial equivalent of the saving in labor, railway stock, and coal, Mr. Cooper arrives at the following conclusion: "We are following a program that is absolutely wrong, relating to \$1,241,600,000 annually of our business life." He adds that the increase of our food supply through the furnishing to our farmers of fertilizers made in this country would represent a further vast saving by the reduction of the cost of food. In a paper read in Seattle, Wash., in May, 1917, H. J. Pierce declared that the doubling of our crops would result from an increase of fertilizer per acre from 28 pounds (America's average for improved lands) to 100 pounds. (England averages 152 pounds and Germany 214.) The additional 18,000,000 tons, he estimated, would entail a production of hydrogen requiring 12,000,000 hydroelectric horsepower. The present water-power development in the country aggregates 5,321,700 horsepower.

Hydroelectric energy, Mr. Pierce pointed out, conditions the manufacture of many electrochemicals, explosives, and metals. It is used in the production of calcium carbide, caustic soda, abrasives, electrodes, acetone, and atmospheric nitric acid, used in making powder and explosives.

Among those who see in hydroelectric development an advance in America's industrial preparedness and a remedy for the strain of her resources caused by the war are to be counted the publishers throughout the country. In seeking relief for the situation regarding newspaper prices the American Newspaper Publishers' Association made an investigation of the potential wood-pulp resources of the country. The committee on paper found that the tapping of fresh timber stands and the development of new mills was possible in a large way only in those western and Pacific regions where the use of hydroelectric power was essential to the enterprise. It was further learned that almost all the available water power was located on the public domain or in navigable streams.

With a view to increasing the paper tonnage produced in the United States the American Newspaper Publishers' Association voted at its convention in Washington, D. C., on June 21, 1917, a resolution favor-

ing the passage of legislation by Congress which would remove the obstacles placed by obsolete laws in the way of water-power development. Copies of the resolution were sent to President Wilson, to other officials of the Government, and to all members of the association.

The growth of water-power restriction has been a gradual process, the result of which was made plain in April of this year when the United States Supreme Court handed down a decision in the Utah power case. It was decided that no official of the Government could bind the Government by contract in issuing permits for the development of water power on public domain, and that any permit issued or to be issued was revocable at any time without compensation.

The provisions of the legislation sought from the present Congress are summed up as follows in an article in the New York Annalist for August 8, 1917:

"Permits for the erection of hydroelectric plants may be issued to individuals, corporations, States, or municipalities for 50 years.

"These contracts are irrevocable, but may be canceled by legal proceedings if the permittee fails to comply with the provisions of the act or the conditions of the permit.

"At the expiration of the term the United States may take over the entire plant or any severable and complete unit at a value determined, which shall not include the value of public lands, rights of way, franchises, good will, or prospective revenues; or it may renew the permit to the original holder; or, in the event that such an arrangement can not be made, may issue the permit to some one else, who shall buy the plant under the same conditions.

"Rental shall be paid which may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be based on the net horsepower, and of this rental one-half shall be paid to the State in which the energy is developed.

"Permits must provide for 'the diligent, orderly, and reasonable development of the water power, subject to market conditions.'

"Rates are determined by the public-service commission of the State in which the power is generated and used; and, when more than one State is involved, by the Interstate Commerce Commission."

The Walsh bill, the Small bill, and the Shields general dam bill—a correction of the provisions of the general dam act of 1906—provide these conditions.

[From the Anaconda (Mont.) Standard, Nov. 22.]

**NEGLECTED WATER-POWER QUESTION LOOMS UP AGAIN.**

After contributing much to the defeat of water-power legislation during the past 10 years, Gifford Pinchot has awakened to the fact that war's demands require the immediate and extensive development of water power within the United States. He is out with an early appeal to Congress, and confesses that we need to use our natural resources, "coal, oil, and water power to win the war." But with this announcement Mr. Pinchot clings to his old contention that Congress must legislate along lines which he long ago laid down, and he goes to the extent of again telling Congress the kind of water-power legislation it must enact.

While Mr. Pinchot is the first to come forward this fall with a demand for water-power legislation, others have been giving the question serious thought. They recall the announcement of the War Department, made only a few months ago, that the United States then had in reserve enough Chilean nitrate to carry it along for a year—nitrates for the manufacture of explosives. Since that announcement was made, the price of Chilean nitrate has risen to fabulous heights; shipping between the United States and Chile has been greatly reduced by the withdrawal of vessels for trans-Atlantic service, and now come press dispatches from Valparaiso announcing the formation of a nitrate trust in Chile, under Government sanction.

The United States to-day is manufacturing no atmospheric nitrogen; its nitrates, both for fertilizer and for explosives, comes mainly from Chile. Yet the United States under proper laws could become independent of Chile, and produce within its own borders not alone the nitrates needed for home consumption but a surplus for export, and in the process would deplete no natural resource but would draw upon the circumambient atmosphere for the all-essential nitrogen. But atmospheric nitrogen can only be produced commercially where water power is developed in large volume and where it can be developed cheaply. All the ideal sites for power plants adapted to this particular industry are now locked up in Federal withdrawals or are on navigable rivers controlled by the Federal Government.

Where is the Government going to get its nitrate supply of the future when the Chilean stocks run low and can not be replenished as fast as needed or at prices at all reasonable? That question is going to loom big in Congress this winter for it is a basic question. With the exhaustion of the American ammunition supply, the American Army in Europe and much of the allied forces will become powerless longer to combat the Huns. Nitrates, quite as much as food and men and ships, are necessary to the winning of the war.

Well established as this fact is, the Government itself has done nothing constructive toward solving the nitrate problem. Congress appropriated \$20,000,000 for the establishment of a Government nitrate factory. Instead of spending that money for the purpose for which it was appropriated, a nitrate commission, headed by the Secretary of War, set aside \$4,000,000 "for investigations into processes of manufacturing nitrates," in face of the fact that several successful processes already have been developed and are being used in Germany, Norway, France, and Italy, and on this continent, in Canada. The remaining \$16,000,000 lies idle in the Treasury at a time when the American stock of nitrates is being gradually exhausted and the need for commercial nitrates is growing hourly.

Mr. Pinchot is as well aware of the nitrate crisis as any man in the United States; he knows in great detail how and where water power can be developed and applied to the production of this all-essential commodity; he is awake to the crying need for extensive water-power development in order that we may have nitrate before it is too late. "We need it," he frankly says, "to win the war." Yet, admitting that, he lays down the same old demands of the conservationists and seeks to place upon the shoulders of the mythical "Water Power Trust" responsibility for defeating water-power legislation in the past.

In the last Congress water-power bills passed Senate and House, but differences arose on both the Ferris and the Shields bills, and the two Houses deadlocked. In consequence, all water-power legislation failed. That being true, Mr. Pinchot can not consistently charge that the "Water Power Trust" killed the legislation, for the deadlock was between the faction representing the Pinchot ideas and the faction demanding water-power legislation. And the fact that the deadlock persisted was evidence enough that the factions were about evenly divided, otherwise the weaker side would have given in. It would seem



from this that the Pinchot conservationists were just as much responsible as the other faction for the defeat of the water-power bills last considered in Congress.

Moreover, Mr. Pinchot now asserts that the United States to-day owns "some 50,000,000 undeveloped horsepower, enough to run every train, trolley, factory, mill, mine, and electrical plant that we have." That the United States holds, or, rather, withholds, this vast quantity of potential power from development is not an indictment of any power trust; it is an indictment of the Government, for Mr. Pinchot is correct in his estimate, and only emphasizes the fact that the Government, with all this power in its possession, not only declines to allow private capital to develop it, but fails to develop this power itself. As against the Government holding, Mr. Pinchot charges that private interests "own and are holding millions of water horsepower undeveloped and out of use," but he gives no figures, and he neglects to state that the larger power sites, the ones best adapted to the production of atmospheric nitrogen, are all under Government control.

As to whether Mr. Pinchot or more practical men should dictate the terms of Federal water-power legislation, it may be cited that the law now on the statute books, the "revocable-permit law," which has proven utterly unworkable, was the product of Mr. Pinchot's brain; it brought on an era of stagnation. And it was such men as Mr. Pinchot who "conserved" the Government coal fields of the West and of Alaska, until to-day, when the United States finds itself short 50,000,000 tons of coal to meet immediate needs, this Government coal is contributing nothing; American industries dependent on coal are hampered; American homes are cold and going to be colder, and the allies, calling vainly for American coal, are unable to have their wants filled. This coal was "conserved" because Mr. Pinchot thought some Americans might make money out of it if allowed to get title to the coal lands. Now the American capitalists are without their profit, but the American public and American industry find themselves without fuel, and without prospect of getting enough to meet their needs.

#### WATER-POWER FIGHT BEGINS.

[From the Editor and Publisher, New York City, Dec. 1, 1917.]

Legislation beneficial to publishers, such as development of water power and the amending or repeal of the recently enacted law increasing second-class mail rates, is likely of early consideration at the coming session of Congress, which opens Monday.

A great drive for water-power legislation will be made by various interests for laws under which the unused water powers of the country can be developed. An effort will be made to pass the Shields bill, or one similar to it.

Capital is insisting that the Government allow 50-year leases for water power. This conservationists of the Pinchot type oppose strenuously. They will do their utmost to block the plans of the men who are trying to force through laws permitting development of water power on a great scale on terms which do not fully conform to their own ideas.

The American Newspaper Publishers' Association is one of the organizations favoring the developing of water power through liberal legislation. The association wishes to see paper made from pulp wood on the public domain and does not regard this practical without adequate water power.

The Shields water-power bill is now on the Senate Calendar, having been reported at the last session. Its early passage is probable.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Dec. 6.]

#### USE WATER; SAVE COAL.

As soon as Congress gets settled down to its tasks, let us hope it will delay no longer than necessary favorable action upon pending legislation that is intended to harness the streams of the country and free the American people, at least partially, from the bondage of coal.

It is gratifying that the President himself shares in this hope so fervently that in his message to Congress he recommends action of this sort "at the earliest possible moment"; and his singularly great document contains no more timely nor wiser advice.

Necessarily the bulk of the legislation to come out of this session of Congress will be of an emergency character, directed to the "stern business" of winning the war, and therefore in effectiveness limited to the duration of the war. But anything that is done to promote the conversion of our falling water into electric energy for heat, lighting, and power uses will serve a dual purpose of helping to win the war and adding to the country's wealth and happiness throughout the long period of peace to follow. It will help to meet an immediate martial necessity and at the same time promote the country's economic welfare and enjoyment of peace.

President Wilson well said that—

"It is imperatively necessary that the consideration of the full use of the water power of the country . . . should be immediately resumed and affirmatively and constructively dealt with at the earliest possible moment. The pressing need of such legislation is daily becoming more obvious."

Indeed, it becomes more obvious with every unanswered cry for fuel; with every boost in the price of coal. It becomes more obvious every time a locomotive passes, straining at its drawbars and pouring out upon the air black clouds of unused potential energy in its wasteful work that could be done a thousandfold more easily and cheaper and expeditiously by a modicum of our wasted gravity power—power that our profligate economic system permits to run wild through our mountain gorges and on to the sea and to waste.

The steam engines of the country, stationary as well as locomotive, consume something like 10 tons of coal in the application of the energy that is contained in one. But even if this were different, and we had engines that would make full use of the power that coal contains, it would be an economic extravagance to use fuel for purposes that gravity can fill, because, once harnessed, gravity is as inexpensive a source of energy as is the wind.

The manner in which the United States has neglected—in fact, made almost prohibitory—the development of its tremendous resources in water power constitutes an economic crime.

It is a crime for which the public to-day is paying dear tribute—paying in suffering from the cold; in exorbitant and increasing prices of commodities in the manufacture or production of which coal plays a part.

And Congress at this time, late as is the day, can do no greater service to America and the world than in making speedy reparation, so far as is possible, for its past omission in this regard.

[From the Baltimore Manufacturers' Record.]

#### WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT A NECESSITY.

The announcement made last week that after wasting priceless time the Government proposes to spend \$20,000,000 upon the construction of nitrate-producing activities at Muscle Shoals, Ala., may be taken as one of the hopeful signs that this Government is coming to a realization of the seriousness of this war. It can be truthfully said, without unfair criticism, that in many of the tremendous issues of this momentous hour our Government has halted, hesitated, back stepped, side stepped, and done most everything else except to step straight forward and march on without a backward movement.

A country boy living 2 miles from school was very late one sleety day, and when called to task by the teacher claimed that the ground was so slippery that every time he made one step forward he slipped back two. The teacher, thinking that he had caught him at last, said: "How did you ever get here?" And the quick reply was: "I turned around and tried to walk home and slipped to school."

Our program has been by slipping backward instead of by straight moving forward. Harsh as the statement may seem to some, it is nevertheless true. In some respects we have made superb progress, due to the tremendous energy and power of the American people as they awaken to the task; but through nearly three years of the greatest of all human tragedies we constantly failed to move forward because we were unwilling to step straight. We saw the inadequate development of our coal industry to meet what all well-informed men knew was an inevitable call of the noncoal-producing countries for all of the coal which they needed. We saw that England's supply of coal to the world must of necessity be shut off, and yet the Government took no broad steps to study the situation or to prepare to meet it. All that was done was by the individual activities of coal people.

We saw railroad transportation breaking down and the inevitable collapse of the railroads; but the Government pled still further burdens upon the railroads, and after practically enchainning them and dooming them to destruction called upon them to go forward. They steadily slipped backward and could not turn around and go forward by moving the other way.

We saw, or we should have seen if our eyes had been open to the careful study of the matter, that for years our food supply was gradually decreasing in proportion to population, and this of absolute necessity, because of the heavy increase in city population as compared with country population. It was as plain as the noonday sun, that with the rapid growth of the consuming population in the cities and the relative decrease of producing population in the country there was inevitably only one end. But we refused to meet the issue, and therefore made no broad plans looking to the increase of our food supply to meet the conditions developed by Europe's war.

We saw that we were wholly dependent upon Chile for nitrates and that this supply was liable to be cut off at any moment, and yet we made no serious move for the development of the water powers necessary for the production of nitrates from the atmosphere. Only to-day are we beginning to do the work looking to the production of nitrates which we should have done years ago. The Nation saw its magnificent water-power potentialities unutilized except to a limited extent. It saw millions and millions of water-power potentialities going to waste as the rivers ran their course idly to the sea, when if harnessed for electricity vast enrichment would have followed and conservation of coal would have been a reality instead of a visionary dream of the visionary theorists of a few years ago. We tied up water-power development. We listened to visionary cranks, to whom we should have given just about as much attention as we should now give to the talk of the pacifists. But the Nation was determined, or the Government was, that nothing should be done in water-power development. Taft blundered, and the present administration has not yet changed these conditions.

A few years ago hundreds of millions of dollars could have been found for the utilization of almost every available power, and to-day millions of horsepower, in addition to what we have, might be operating our factories, our electric lines, and perchance some of our railroads to the great saving of coal. But nothing was done.

It is to be hoped that the movement toward developing the great power possibilities of Muscle Shoals, where more than 600,000 horsepower can be created, and building at that point a nitrate plant, indicates that the theorists and the cranks are to be set aside and the Nation is to go forward in real, substantial work, doing the things which are necessary to the winning of the war and making possible the conservation of energies now wasted, and the fullest possible production of all resources in food and manufactures, in transportation by rail and by motor truck and by water of which the country is capable.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Republican, Dec. 6, 1917.]

#### UTILIZE THE NATION'S WATER POWER.

At a time when the liberation of the country's dormant energies is one of the prime requisites of the Nation in putting forth its strength to meet the tremendous responsibilities of the world war it should need no special argument to convince Congress of the great importance of developing the water power of the United States.

In his message to Congress this week President Wilson said:

"It is imperatively necessary that the consideration of the full use of the water power of the country and the consideration of the systematic and yet economical development of such of the natural resources of the country as are still under the control of the Federal Government should be resumed and affirmatively and constructively dealt with at the earliest possible moment."

The vast importance of the Nation's undeveloped water power has been frequently urged by Gifford Pinchot, who has made a special study of the subject and who is probably better informed regarding its potential possibilities than any other man in the United States. In a recently published statement Mr. Pinchot earnestly advocates congressional action on this question and points out the great value of adding the Nation's water power to its wealth-producing activities.

In numerous ways the gigantic forces that are going to waste along the country's great water courses might be profitably employed to serve the interests of the American people in actuating mills and factories and the multitudinous activities to which power could be furnished economically from this source.

Power is one of the great elements of the Nation's strength. Never has its value or its need been more apparent than at present. The United States has been bountifully enriched by nature with an illimitable supply of undeveloped power, and in no form is it cheaper or more easily accessible than in water power, which can be speedily transformed into electrical energy.



This is a question which calls for early attention on the part of Congress. The Walsh bill and the Shields bill, now pending in the Senate, should receive prompt consideration. This is right in line with one of the subjects now uppermost, namely, the quickening of fuel production for power, and can properly supplement that enterprise without interfering with its industrial aspects.

It is a patriotic duty to add to the country's strength wherever possible in this strenuous period, and such a mighty factor for service as the Nation's water power should not be permitted to remain undeveloped when it can and should be utilized for the public good.

[From the New York Evening Post, Dec. 6, 1917.]

NEW CONGRESS DRIVE FOR WATER-POWER LEGISLATION—SIGNS THAT WAR NEEDS WILL HASTEN ACTION.

There is a strong prospect that Congress will at last meet the need for a safe and sane development of water power, which has been delayed through the failure of session after session to enact the necessary legislation. Coupled with the need of water-power development for mere domestic purposes comes the overwhelming demand for it in connection with war industries. There can be no doubt but that, as a result of President Wilson's demand for such legislation in his message to Congress, this session will see a determined effort to get bills through both Houses for the development of water power on the public lands and on the navigable streams.

Noteworthy in connection with the determination to bring about legislation, if possible, is the spirit of conciliation developing between the radical conservationists, headed by Gifford Pinchot, and the radical anticonservationists, who have tried to keep Federal hands off water-power development in the far West. While it would be too much to expect Mr. Pinchot to violate the conservation principles for which he stands, and equally too much to expect the opponents of his program to surrender to him, the fact remains that the "get-together" spirit with which the country is doing business nowadays as a result of the war has helped convince both sides that the present stalemate on legislation in Congress is not the patriotic situation which either can afford to sponsor in the future.

On the whole, there has not been the same objection in the past on the part of the radical conservationists to the water-power bill for the public domain as there has been to the water-power bill covering navigable streams. In fact, it has been the opinion of those who have watched the progress of both measures that if the proponents of the anticonservation navigable streams bill would compromise their differences with the opposition on that measure both could be passed without much trouble. It has hardly been a secret that one measure has been played against the other to the extent that there has been no action possible on either. The time has now come, in the opinion of high officials and Members of Congress, to make a mighty drive for both bills, and once that drive is made the truth will come out, if it has to come out.

For some time past the American Newspaper Publishers' Association has been trying to weigh the relative merits of the opposing sides in the water-power controversy understandingly. It has taken a recent letter written by Mr. Pinchot, which he concluded with a quotation from the President—"the supreme test of the Nation has come: we must all speak, act, and serve together"—as a hopeful sign that implacable warfare over water-power legislation is at an end and the spirit of conciliation and coordination and cooperation is at hand. In his letter Mr. Pinchot makes the following seven points in his platform for water-power legislation:

- (1) The thing to do with water power is to develop it. Whatever retards or restricts the development of public water powers on terms fair to the public is against public policy and hostile to the general welfare.
- (2) Water power belongs to the people. The sites where it is produced should always be held in public hands, for only so can effective control in the general interest be secured.
- (3) Where public development is not desired the right to use water-power sites should be leased for periods long enough to permit sound, attractive, and profitable investment, but never longer than 50 years. At the end of each lease all rights should return to the people who gave them.
- (4) In order to protect the consumer against extortion, rates and service should be regulated by Federal authority when State or local authorities fail to do so.
- (5) Reasonably prompt and complete development and continuous operation, subject to market conditions, should be required. Already millions of water horsepower are held out of use to further monopoly by private corporations.
- (6) Corporations or individuals who make money out of rights granted by the people should share their profits with the people.
- (7) The public has a right to complete information about every business based on the use of public property.

Taking the Shields bill, covering water-power development on navigable streams, now pending in the Senate, and the Walsh bill, covering water power on navigable streams, now pending in the Senate Committee on Public Lands, as a basis of argument, the American Newspaper Publishers' Association finds that, in its opinion, the contentions of Mr. Pinchot are contained in these bills in substance as to every point except the third. Even in that case the association states that "unless Mr. Pinchot's statement means more than appears on the surface, it is an exact description of the leasing system proposed in the Walsh and Shields bills."

Continuing, however, the association goes directly to the hub of the argument between Pinchot and the proponents of these bills when it says:

"Both bills limit the term of the lease to 50 years by providing that at the end of that time the Government may retake the rights and either use them itself or grant them to other parties. That is not, however, all there is to the matter. Mr. Pinchot desires that at the end of each lease 'all rights should return to the people who gave them,' but Mr. Pinchot would not claim that at the end of the lease the situation existing at the beginning could be actually reconstructed.

"It is impossible to ignore the fact that development has taken place in the interim; that a dam has been constructed; a power house erected, power equipment installed, transmission lines set up, and a power supply offered and taken by consumers, including cities, industries, and a vast number of individuals who have become dependent upon it. If the right to utilize the dam site were returned at the end of the lease, without any provision being made for the power business developed, vast injustice would be done, not only chiefly to the investor but to the general public itself.

"Obviously this is a situation which is to be dealt with, and, except for dealing with it in a manner which at the same time aims to safeguard in the highest degree the principle of recapture, which Mr. Pinchot speaks for, there is no conflict between the Walsh and Shields bills and the ideas expressed in the third point made by Mr. Pinchot."

Obviously, the association is not quite clear in its own mind whether Mr. Pinchot will subscribe to its entire judgment as to the meaning of his letter and the actual contents of the Walsh and Shields bills, but it invites and it would welcome his assistance, which, it admits, would be "of great importance." The association rejects the idea that Federal development of water power will solve the situation on the ground that State regulations would interfere, that the properties could not be taxed, and that neither rates nor the nature of the service could then be determined by local authorities. The prediction is made that to switch the issue to one of Federal development at this time would be certain to revive the old controversy in all its glory. Congress would be sure to approach such a new angle gingerly, while legislation is now necessary from every point of view. The President said on this point:

"It is imperatively necessary that the consideration of the full use of the water power of the country and also the consideration of the systematic and yet economical development of such of the natural resources of the country as are yet under the control of the Federal Government should be immediately resumed and affirmatively and constructively dealt with at the earliest possible moment. The pressing need of such legislation is daily becoming more obvious."

After this clarion call to action the country will be interested in watching developments to see which side to the old water-power controversy, if any, interposes the first insurmountable objection to early legislation. The reason for such objection will have to be definite and understandable, in view of the need of the country for laws under which to move forward in water-power development.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, July 30, 1917.]

HARNESS THE WATER POWERS AND SAVE COAL.

In this time of industrial difficulties, when the supply of coal is far behind the requirements and the railroads are choked with freight, the interest of commercial leaders turn as never before to the project of progressive waterways development. Secretary Redfield recently issued a statement on this subject, in which he called attention to the views of prominent railway officials that our existing transportation lines, even when operated at 100 per cent of their capacity, can not handle the full volume of traffic thrown upon them. What will the conditions be in the near future, he asks, when, in addition to the present flow of munitions and other manufactures and supplies, the concentration of troops is undertaken and the new crops begin to move toward the ports and market centers? Railroads are canceling passenger trains and ordering additional cars and locomotives to relieve the difficulty, but other means of relief must be invoked. Steps should be taken, he says, to encourage water transit and to extemporize, if need be, means for bringing it quickly into service.

While the Secretary's appeal looks primarily to the adoption of emergency measures to bridge existing difficulties, the effect of the situation is to direct attention as never before to the broad bearings of our waterway problems. At this juncture the Shields bill, providing for Federal regulation of the construction of dams and the operation of power plants on navigable waterways, comes to the front as a measure calculated to augment the means of transportation, expand our industrial facilities, and conserve our stores of coal. This measure, which failed of passage in the last Congress, has recently been reported anew by the Senate Committee on Commerce. On its own merits and in its bearing on the national-defense situation it is worthy of being made a subject for prompt legislation.

By the terms of this bill Congress would give its outright consent to the erection of dams, diversion structures, and accessory features for water-power plants whenever the Secretary of War, with the approval of the Chief of Engineers, issues a permit to that effect. Such a permit may be given in case it is found that the plans submitted are best adapted for the comprehensive development of a waterway for navigation, full development of its water power and utilization of the water resources of the region, with the understanding that the recipient of such permit shall pay the Government reasonable charges for benefits accruing from the institution of headwater improvements. The revenue thus derived would be set aside as a headwater improvement fund. Among contesting applicants the one is to be chosen who has first secured the diversion rights and otherwise qualified under the laws of the State, or where there are no State laws to be considered preference is to be given to the first applicant. The duration of such permits would be 50 years, and thereafter until termination by 2 years' notice in writing and the taking over at a fair value by the United States of all property dependent for its usefulness upon the rights given in the bill. Rates charged for service by the holders of such permits would have to be reasonable according to the laws of the State, or, if there be no State authority, the Interstate Commerce Commission.

It is highly desirable that this subject should be taken up for consideration by Congress at the earliest practicable moment, with a view to definite action. A difference of opinion exists as to what conditions it is desirable to impose in the interest and protection of the public relative to the length of terms covered by permits, the condition of their revocation, and so on. But it is not well that our vast water-power facilities should remain locked because different schools of legislation are unable to agree as to what is feasible and advisable.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Republican, Aug. 10, 1917.]

THE NATION'S WATER POWER.

If civilization were as prompt in voting great sums of money for peaceful development as it is in appropriating colossal amounts for the destructive purposes of war, the advance of modern progress would be much more rapid than it is. The world would then behold a condition in which many of the forces that are now slumbering in unproductive idleness, or going to waste, would be ministering to the needs of mankind.

We have particularly in mind the vast possibilities of water power in the United States, and its potentialities for actuating industry in many directions, as well as the scientific uses it would serve in stimulating the agricultural, manufacturing, and transportation facilities of this country.

Senator JOHN K. SHIELDS, of Tennessee, speaking on this subject recently in the Senate, cited some interesting facts and figures in support of his illuminated argument favoring the development of water power in the navigable rivers of the United States. He said: "There is no country in the world that has greater natural waterways than



this, and with proper improvement they can be made to contribute as much to its commercial and industrial wealth as any of its other great natural resources."

Quoting from the report of the Bureau of Statistics, Senator SHIELDS said it shows that the primary power equipment in the United States in commercial and municipal central stations, street and railway stations, and manufacturing plants in 1912 was 30,448,246 horsepower, of which 80 per cent was steam power, and more than one-half of this was found in the States of Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, California, and Michigan. He pointed out that the annual consumption of coal in this country is 480,000,000 tons, valued at about \$1,000,000,000, and claimed that while the coal fields will supply the country's needs for a century or more, they are not inexhaustible; neither is the supply of oil or gas.

The future of water power, converted into hydroelectrical energy is, therefore, of proximate interest. It has been well said that "water power is unlike most natural resources in that it is not diminished by use, nor is it conserved by nonuse." In this respect it differs from coal, which, if not used to-day, remains to be used later. A strong argument for water power is that its utilization results in the saving of coal for future use.

Among the many uses to be served by the development of the country's great wealth of dormant water power, Senator SHIELDS pointed out that of producing atmospheric nitrogen at low cost to enable the farmers to fertilize their fields and increase their crops.

The immediate results of liberating, for industrial purposes, the Nation's wealth of unused water power is the effect it would have in lessening the cost of production in many ways, and distributing its advantages to every city in the land. The undeveloped water power of the United States is one of its greatest assets, and its early utilization should receive the attention of Congress.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce and Finance, Jan. 2, 1918.]  
PROBLEM OF WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT—PROPOSED GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS DETER CAPITAL.

(By G. H. Walbridge, vice president of Bonbright & Co.)

The existing acute shortage of coal, the use of a large number of cars for coal transportation when cars are urgently needed for other purposes, and the fact that the Shields bill has again been passed by the Senate, bring prominently to the front once more the question of development of water powers on land controlled by the Government.

It is proposed in the Shields bill, as in other bills relating to the same subject, that the Government, in granting rights for development of water powers located partly or wholly on Government land, shall restrict the grant in three ways: First, the grant shall not be permanent, but the Government shall have the right of recapture; that is, it may purchase the entire hydro development on payment of a price after the lapse of a certain number of years; second, that the Government shall tax the development; third, that the Government shall retain the right to supervise accounts and regulate rates. It is not generally understood that, except for navigation purposes on navigable streams, the Government has no title to nor interest in the water. The right to regulate is based solely on the Government's control of such lands as may be needed for dams, power houses, or similar structures.

No one seems to question the desirability of immediate development of water powers, although it should be borne in mind that they can not be constructed overnight, since the work is necessarily dependent on the seasons of the year and machinery and other requisites are subject to the same delays as are materials for other kinds of work. The probabilities are that any water-power developments begun as a result of favorable congressional action can not be completed before the end of the war, unless the war lasts more than two years longer.

The whole question of regulation of water powers on Federal-controlled lands has been the subject of much emotional, not to say hysterical, oratory. The so-called conservationists appear to feel that a water power is equivalent to a gold mine and therefore must be controlled for the benefit of the people. The fact that drought and flood, overruns in cost, and disappointments in markets put hydroelectrics on the same plane as the average business enterprise is obvious to anyone who will spend a few hours studying the troubled financial history of many of the existing hydroelectric companies. Hence, to bolster up their case the conservationists invented a fantastic myth about a menacing "water-power trust," which as a matter of easily established fact never existed and never will. All this has resulted in much discussion in Congress and elsewhere and a consequent delay of years which might have been occupied in building plants.

As a matter of common sense, the Government should take its hands off, since no regulation or restriction by the Government is necessary or desirable, with this exception, which applies to everything that follows, namely, that the Government should throw such restrictions around the grant of rights as will prevent any individual or group from securing rights and holding them indefinitely without development.

Every State in the Union has the inherent right, and most of them exercise, through commissions, the right to regulate rates charged by all public utilities, including hydroelectrics. These commissions have generally ruled that utilities are entitled to earn a "fair return" on the fair value of property used and useful in serving the public. This "fair return" is frequently fixed as 8 per cent annually upon such value and seldom, if ever, is fixed as high as 10 per cent. Let us assume the usual figure of 8 per cent and see what it means. It is that part of the total earnings remaining after deducting actual operating expenses plus a reasonable allowance for depreciation, and is what is left to pay interest on the invested money, provide a contingent fund against calamities, physical or industrial, and pay a "profit" to the organizers and managers of the enterprise. It will be noted the usual argument about "overcapitalization," "paying dividends on watered stock," etc., falls of its own weight, since the percentage of return is based on a value established principally by physical inventory and the amount of securities issued is disregarded. Incidentally the prospect of being able to earn 8 per cent is not sufficient to tempt a shrewd investor to undertake the manifold risks of hydroelectric construction, especially in view of the fact that seasoned securities can be purchased in the open market to yield nearly as much. Assuming, however, for argument that this is a fair rate, we have this condition: If the State exercises its power of regulation—and most of them do—the hydroelectric plant can not earn more than 8 per cent on its investment. If the hydroelectric can earn only 8 per cent, what further regulation is needed? The public does not need it. The public pays only the cost of operation plus 8 per cent on the value of the plant.

Further, why should the Federal Government tax the hydroelectric, since under equitable regulation the taxes must be passed along to the consumer, who is thus taxed for the benefit of the country at large?

Why should the Government reserve the right to take the plant away at the end of 50 years on the payment of a price, presumably equitable, but subject to all the uncertainties of such a procedure? The customer does not require this protection and the prospect discourages capital. The Government can condemn any plant needed for governmental purposes at any time, but unless the country wishes to embark in Federal ownership of local utilities there is no reason why the Government should take over hydro plants now or 50 years hence.

To recapitulate, if under existing laws and procedure the utility can earn only 8 per cent, what need is there for any regulation or recapture by the Federal Government, and what is in the minds of the people who advocate such regulation and recapture? Most of them are too sensible and too honest to desire it merely for the purposes of building up a special Federal bureau. They must, therefore, be actuated by a mistaken idea of their duty to the people, who are, however, fully protected under existing conditions, and who are, through this exercise of undue care on the part of the Federal Government, being deprived of the benefits from water powers that would otherwise have been in operation long ago. The proposed regulations deter capital, discourage development, and are unnecessary for the protection of the public. What useful function will they perform?

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Mercury, Dec. 27, 1917.]

A most important piece of legislation is being rushed through Congress which deserves more attention than it is receiving. The reference is to the bill providing for the development of water power, which passed the Senate shortly before the holidays, and which will come up for consideration in the House, where it is said it will pass with ease. The President referred to the need for such legislation in his address to the joint Houses this month, and the Senate has been prompt to respond. The legislation has heretofore been hotly contested, being fought over every inch of the way by those seeking to effect legislation to encourage capital to interest itself in water-power development and by the conservationists, with Gifford Pinchot at the head, who have been of the opinion that water-power development should be so bound in chains that the people may ever be in control of these water rights, getting a good deal for nothing. With this dog-in-the-manger policy the conservation movement has been able to obstruct all attempts to develop water power. Capital was not going to risk millions for the sake of a paltry dividend and the likelihood of endless trouble through Government regulation and the probability that at the termination of the leasing proposed the value of their equities would be reduced to nothing.

In consequence of the conflict of opinion nothing has been done at all in this direction. The country possesses enormous water power which could be used to high advantage in many of the industrial communities of the land and at the saving of many tons of coal, for which there is now the greatest need imaginable. This very fact has sufficed to knock the props from under the conservationists, who have come to their senses and have withdrawn obstructive tactics, so that when the bill mentioned came up for consideration in the Senate, instead of fighting it desperately they simply stated in brief why they would vote against it. The last-ditch fighting hardly lasted more than an hour and only 18 votes were cast against the bill, whereas 46 votes were cast for it. It remains to be seen how loudly Mr. Roosevelt will shriek. He has been one of the archconservationists. With much ado, self-righteous, indeed, he vetoed the earlier bills to permit water-power development, in particular the Snake River Dam bill, a veto for which Gifford Pinchot was credited. The bill passed by the Senate recently in effect provides for the improvement of rivers by dams for hydroelectric purposes without cost to the Government. Grants will be issued by the Secretary of War to private parties for the construction and maintenance of them, the grants being leases to extend 50 years at least, or until the property necessary for the development is taken over and just payment made either by the Government or a duly authorized new grantee. Regulation of rates and service will be made by the public authorities, either the Interstate Commerce Commission, if the business is interstate, or by the State authorities if the business is wholly intrastate.

Other features in the bill protect the people to be served fully, and yet the terms are not made onerous and prohibitive to capital. Seemingly there can be no monopoly, in so far as the phraseology of the bill is concerned, but this has been the cry of the Pinchot people, although it has seemed to sane people that there never could be a monopoly in water power in the country, since water-power sites were virtually innumerable. The only water-power monopoly that has been in existence has been the group of conservationists, who have exerted a power heretofore absolutely preventing anybody from making use of a great natural resource. It has been a monopoly of the worst type. At last it seems to have been put out of business.

It is claimed by the Geological Survey of the Government that the available potential horsepower of the country is 61,678,000, of which 4,910,000 is in the North Atlantic States. It is also estimated that with practical maximum storage the total available water horsepower that could be produced in the United States would be 200,000,000. The present actual water power used in the country is about 6,000,000, showing how little the land has made use of a source of vast power in its domains. It is said that the 61,000,000 horsepower mentioned is the equivalent of the annual use of 340,000,000 tons of coal—60 per cent of the total amount used in the United States a year, which at \$2 a ton means an annual value of \$680,000,000. Delay in the water-power legislation has thus meant this much enormous loss annually to the people and they suffering to-day as a consequence. Where the conservationists have sought to save, they have really wasted in immense figures.

The enterprises so far have not, of course, attained the high figures quoted, but through the delay in water-power legislation the development of 2,122,000 horsepower, covering the improvement of 1,160 miles of waterway, has been stalled—30,000 horsepower in the Connecticut River. It is said that these figures represent the equivalent in energy of 7,214,000 tons of coal, which would require the labor of 7,000 men at the mines to produce and 200,000 35-ton cars to move. In these days when the shortage of coal pinches and when there is so much distress and incommuting, these figures burn. It is astonishing that the people should have allowed themselves to be so long obstructed by theorists and visionaries.

[From the Little Rock (Ark.) Gazette, Dec. 17, 1917.]

TO HARNESS THE WATER POWERS.

The bill of Senator SHIELDS, of Tennessee, for development of water powers on navigable streams, which failed in a conference deadlock in the last Congress, has been again passed by the Senate and now goes to the House.



Under this measure water power development on navigable streams would be under the control of the War Department, which would have authority to grant 50-year permits for development projects.

Present circumstances have made more urgent the need for utilizing the country's water power. There is now a nation-wide fuel shortage, and for lack of sufficient supplies of coal many electric plants are having difficulty in continuing in operation. Yet, if streams that could be harnessed were harnessed many communities could be supplied with light and power from hydroelectric plants. The cutting off of German chemical supplies has started America to manufacturing dyes and other articles that were formerly imported. But nothing would put forward our chemical industry more than hydroelectric power. The bauxite of Arkansas is taken to Niagara Falls and to a plant in east Tennessee to be made into aluminum with electric current generated by water power. And there are in Arkansas and other States many resources that with the aid of electric power could be converted into useful commodities.

[From the New York Herald, Jan. 7, 1918.]

#### OUR WASTED WATER POWER.

"Better late than never." After wasting in discussion and wranglings many years that could have been devoted to building water-power plants on lands controlled by the Government, it seems that at last Congress will do something practical.

President Wilson has submitted a report signed by the heads of the War, Interior, and Agricultural Departments and the draft of a bill designed to reconcile divergent views and obtain legislation to save the 35,000,000 horsepower that now is wasted every year.

It is the pressure of war that is bringing this matter to a head. As Mr. Wilson stated at a conference with the leaders of the House, the early development of a considerable portion of our water-power resources would not only save fuel but lessen the present demand on transportation facilities caused by the moving of coal and other heavy fuels.

As a result of the conference, a special committee of the House is projected to take jurisdiction of all water-power problems that are in the hands of the various committees, pass the President's bill, and send it to the Senate with the support of the administration. This is a businesslike suggestion and promises results. That there will be much discussion, in which the alleged "Water Power Trust" will again figure, goes without saying, and this means further delay.

After the needed legislation is obtained, it is going to take a year or two to construct plants sufficient to afford perceptible relief. We repeat, "Better late than never"; but, in view of all the time that has been lost, there is call at this tardy date for immediate action. The Shields bill, which has again passed the Senate, has many provisions designed to protect the interest of the people—retention by Government of the right to buy back the plants after a fixed period, to tax developments, supervise accounts, and regulate rates.

Every State has the right—which most of them exercise through commissions—to regulate the rates of all public-utility companies, including hydroelectric plants. In the opinion of some thoroughly informed persons, the Government should confine itself to preventing rights from being obtained and held without development and leave all other restrictions and regulations to the several States.

[From St. Louis Globe Democrat, Mar. 10, 1916.]

#### SHIELDS WATER-POWER BILL.

The decisive vote of the Senate in favor of the Shields water-power bill was a victory for the school of conservation which believes that the water should be used for power as soon as possible, so as to conserve coal and petroleum. The resolutions committee of the Fifth National Conservation Congress estimated that the country could save \$200,000,000 a year on fuel by prompt development of hydroelectric power. There is another and smaller school of conservation, of which Mr. Pinchot is the most prominent personality, which is chiefly interested in keeping the water-power sites out of private hands. This school has gloried in the defeat of previous bills, but has done nothing toward utilizing water power. It has saved waterfalls from use, but has let the country pay its excessive annual toll for steam power.

The long debate in the Senate revealed that the principal question is whether the Government or State shall be permitted to take over a plant at the end of 50 years at the actual value then, determined by agreement or condemnation proceedings, or whether it shall pay only what the plant has actually cost. There is no agreement to take it over at all. The investor is asked to make the venture. If he loses money, it is hopelessly lost. If he builds up a valuable property he must sell out, if the Government wishes to buy, for what the site costs now, with his actual expenditures added. It is a "heads I win and tails you lose" proposition. Nobody favors Government or State ownership now. The Government merely asks an option, which can be exercised if the experiment is successful.

The bill provides for control of charges by State and Federal authorities. Every reasonable safeguard is provided to prevent abuse. The sites must be acquired at actual value, under the various State laws. There is no bonus or grant, such as Congress voted the railroads for the development of the great West. A slight monopolistic feature is almost unavoidable, but the bill prohibits improper practices as well as discriminatory charges. The critics of the bill offer no constructive alternative. They would merely load the bill down with such amendments that capital would not take the risk. If they have their way, they should entitle their act "An academic theory as to how water power might be developed if capital could be induced to invest in the experiment."

[Editorial from the Evening Post, New York, Friday, May 5, 1916.]

That the National Conservation Congress should have indorsed the Shields bill by a vote of 116 to 39 is a severe blow to Pinchot, Garfield, and other extreme conservationists. There was no division upon principles, but merely upon the interpretation of the Shields measure. The majority of the Conservation Congress plainly thought that its provisions could be accepted literally and in good faith. It meant what it said in giving the Government the right to take over private water-power plants on navigable streams at the end of 50 years at actual valuation. But ex-Secretary of the Interior Garfield was certain that the bill "turns over to private monopoly public power in perpetuity. The 50-years' limitation as proposed is nothing more than a mere fiction." The minority resolutions held that power sites should not be disposed of in perpetuity, but retained in Federal control. The majority made much of the fact that the Senate, after careful debate, had not seen in the bill the "mere fiction" of which Garfield spoke,

and an even weightier consideration is that Secretary Lane has not done so. Upon details of the measure there may be disagreement, but its guaranty of a 50-years' tenure seems necessary to invite capital into a risky field.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2784) to authorize the purchase by the city of McMinnville, Oreg., of certain lands formerly embraced in the grant to the Oregon & California Railroad Co. and revested in the United States by the act approved June 9, 1916 (Rept. No. 228); and

A bill (S. 3225) to reserve as a part of the Oregon National Forest certain lands that were revested in the United States pursuant to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Oregon & California Railroad Co. against the United States (Rept. No. 229).

Mr. SHAFROTH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 2315) to extend the time within which final proof is required to be submitted upon any lawful pending desert-land entry made prior to July 1, 1915, such extension not to exceed three years from the date of allowance thereof, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 225) thereon.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 101) to authorize the consolidation of Government lands and of privately owned lands, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 226); and

A bill (S. 972) to authorize an exchange of lands with Henry Blackburn (Rept. No. 227).

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2931) for the relief of Thomas Sevy (Rept. No. 230);

A bill (S. 100) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent for certain lands in the State of Utah to Cyrena E. Young (Rept. No. 231);

A bill (S. 97) authorizing the exchange of certain lands in the State of Utah for the protection of the water supply of Salt Lake City (Rept. No. 232);

A bill (S. 94) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. L., p. 1133) (Rept. No. 233); and

A bill (S. 92) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent for certain lands in the State of Utah to E. D. Partridge (Rept. No. 234).

Mr. TILLMAN, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3128) to authorize additional pay for enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps detained beyond the expiration of their terms of enlistment, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 224) thereon.

#### FOX RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 3448) granting the consent of Congress to the village of East Dundee and the village of West Dundee to construct a bridge across the Fox River, and I submit a report (No. 235) thereon. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### FRIEZE IN THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL.

Mr. GALLINGER. I report from the Committee on the Library favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 125) authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to provide for the restoration and completion of the historical frieze in the rotunda of the Capitol, and I submit a report (No. 236) thereon. I think there can be no objection to the joint resolution and I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. OVERMAN. Let it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Joint Committee on the Library be, and it is hereby, authorized to provide for the restoration and completion of the historical frieze in the Rotunda of the Capitol. For that purpose the



said joint committee is empowered to select an appropriate design for the completion of the frieze and to employ such artists in the work of completion and restoration as may demonstrate to the satisfaction of said joint committee their ability to perform the work in a proper manner.

SEC. 2. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purposes of this resolution.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### CLAIMS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I report from the Committee on the Judiciary favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1795) to relieve Congress from the adjudication of private claims against the Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to add that Senate bill 832, to amend an act approved March 4, 1915, abolishing the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims in certain cases involving claims against the United States for property destroyed or appropriated by the Federal Army during the Civil War, and Senate bill 2488, to relieve Congress from the adjudication of private claims against the Government, have reference to the same subject. The bill which I have reported, with amendments, is intended as a substitute for these two bills, and I report them adversely and ask that they be postponed indefinitely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from Georgia desires the indefinite postponement of Senate bill 2488 and Senate bill 832?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I move that the bills be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

#### FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR NEWLANDS.

Mr. THOMPSON, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred S. Res. 177, submitted by Mr. Pittman on the 9th instant, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate, the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of the Hon. Francis G. Newlands, late a Senator from the State of Nevada, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

#### EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CLERK.

Mr. THOMPSON. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably with an amendment Senate resolution 158, authorizing the Committee on Privileges and Elections to employ an additional clerk, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment was in line 5, after the word "Senate," to strike out "from December 3, 1917," and insert "for a period lasting until."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections of the United States Senate be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an additional clerk at the rate of \$100 per month, to be paid out of the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate, for a period lasting until the end of the present session of the Congress.

#### YUMA PROJECT, ARIZONA.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I ask unanimous consent to make a report from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands on a bill designed to carry out the purposes of the act providing for what is known as the Yuma project, in my State, and which provides merely for the transfer of certain funds. It has been recommended by the Secretary of the Interior; it has passed the House without a dissenting vote; and it is in the nature of a local matter designed to extend the Yuma project under the original act. I report the bill (H. R. 3135) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for an auxiliary reclamation project in connection with the Yuma project, Arizona, and I submit a report (No. 237) thereon.

In order to meet an exigency that exists in connection with that project, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will first be read.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the first sentence of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for an auxiliary reclamation project in connection with the Yuma project, Arizona," approved January 25, 1917, be amended so as to read as follows:

"That the money in said auxiliary reclamation fund of the Yuma project, Arizona, shall be available for the construction or completion of irrigation works of the said auxiliary project or unit."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, as I caught the reading of the bill, there is no further appropriation asked for.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. None in the world; it merely provides for a transfer of the fund so as to carry out the project.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is all?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Yes; there is not appropriated from the Public Treasury an additional dollar.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I understood the Senator to say that the bill was reported from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Yes; it has been reported from that committee. I have taken it up with several members of the committee, and regret that I was not also able to see the Senator from Washington and ask his views in regard to the measure.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator polled the committee?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The committee was polled—the Senator knows the difficulty of having the committee meet—and the measure was explained to each member who was seen, and no one of them objected to it. I would have seen the Senator from Washington if I had had an opportunity.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is all right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 3631) to convey certain lands to the city of Boise, State of Idaho, for a municipal park (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of South Carolina:

A bill (S. 3632) to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3633) to authorize the construction of a dam or dams, a lock or locks, and other works in and across Sabine Lake in order to protect certain rice lands from salt water; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 3634) granting an increase of pension to Frederick H. Barker (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3635) granting an increase of pension to John W. Keffer (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 3636) granting to the States in which national forests are situate lands to aid in the construction of public roads in such national forests; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3637) granting a pension to Charles S. Abbott;

A bill (S. 3638) granting an increase of pension to John Cook, Jr.;

A bill (S. 3639) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hamilton;

A bill (S. 3640) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Jewell;

A bill (S. 3641) granting an increase of pension to Lawrence O. Loughlin;

A bill (S. 3642) granting an increase of pension to Albert N. Raymond;

A bill (S. 3643) granting an increase of pension to Logan Russell;

A bill (S. 3644) granting a pension to Elizabeth Webster; and

A bill (S. 3645) to amend an act entitled "An act to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars from January 1, 1859, to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Pensions.



By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 3646) to grant rights of way over Government lands for reservoir purposes for the conservation and storage of water to be used by the city of San Diego, Cal., and adjacent communities (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HOLLIS:

A bill (S. 3647) granting a pension to Joseph H. Chapman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 3648) for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 3649) to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, establishing postal-savings depositories, and acts amendatory thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 3650) granting a pension to Mary Herman (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 3651) granting a pension to Clara Stillman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 3652) authorizing the leasing of the lands embraced within the Hoh Indian Reservation in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KELLOGG:

A bill (S. 3653) for the relief of Ben. L. Fairbanks and others; and

A bill (S. 3654) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render final judgment in the matter of claims of the Chippewa Indians and the several bands or tribes thereof in the State of Minnesota against the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 3655) granting an increase of pension to Charles Dwight Hanscom (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3656) granting an increase of pension to Daniel L. Thompson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN:

A bill (S. 3657) to provide promotion for retired officers performing active duty in time of war;

A bill (S. 3658) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to increase facilities of naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I.; and

A bill (S. 3659) to increase temporarily the enlisted strength of the Navy, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 3660) granting a pension to Walter J. Hawthorne (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

#### AMENDMENT TO INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SMOOT submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$12,690 for payment to the Uinta and Duchesne County school districts to assist said districts in educating children of white lessees of Indian lands, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

#### WHEAT SUPPLY.

Mr. FRANCE. I offer a resolution and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In this connection I wish to say that when the proper opportunity presents itself I desire to address the Senate very briefly for about 12 minutes upon this most important subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 190) was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

*Resolved*, That in view of the serious shortage in the Nation's supply of wheat, the necessity for large exports of wheat, and the alarming report of the Department of Agriculture on December 19, 1917, upon the condition of the winter-wheat crop, that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Food Administrator be, and they are hereby, requested and directed to assemble and transmit to the Senate information as to the methods which are being employed for the conservation of an adequate supply of seed wheat for the sowing of the spring-wheat acreage and what methods are being used or are in contemplation to insure the sowing of such an extraordinarily increased acreage as is imperatively needed to meet the present grave emergency.

#### CRIPPLED SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 189) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Federal Board for Vocational Education be directed to furnish to the Senate such information as it may have or can readily obtain on the rehabilitation and vocational reeducation of crippled soldiers and sailors.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, we are quite anxious to have the information as speedily as possible for the use and study of the Committee on Education and Labor. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. JONES of Washington. On the 21st instant I gave notice of an amendment to the standing rules of the Senate relative to the appointment of the committees. I now offer the following resolution, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Rules.

The resolution (S. Res. 191) was referred to the Committee on Rules, as follows:

*Resolved*, That beginning with the Sixty-sixth Congress, Rule XXV of the standing rules of the Senate be amended to read as follows:

"Rule XXV. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, with leave to report by bill or otherwise:

- "A Committee on Appropriations.
- "A Committee on Commerce.
- "A Committee on Finance.
- "A Committee on Foreign Relations.
- "A Committee on Interstate Commerce.
- "A Committee on the Judiciary.
- "A Committee on Banking and Currency.
- "A Committee on Public Lands.
- "A Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.
- "A Committee on the District of Columbia.
- "A Committee on Rules.
- "A Committee on the Census.
- "A Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.
- "A Committee on Claims.
- "A Committee on Education and Labor.
- "A Committee on Insular Affairs.
- "A Committee on Indian Affairs.
- "A Committee on Immigration.
- "A Committee on Military Affairs.
- "A Committee on Naval Affairs.
- "A Committee on Pensions.
- "A Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.
- "A Committee on Printing, which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives.
- "A Committee on Enrolled Bills, which shall have power to act jointly with a similar committee of the House of Representatives, and which, or some member of which, shall examine all bills or joint resolutions which shall have passed the Senate or both Houses to see that the same are correctly engrossed or enrolled, and, when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall present the same forthwith, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the United States in person and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate.
- "A Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which shall have power to act jointly with a similar committee of the House of Representatives.
- "A Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which shall be referred all resolutions directing the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same."

The foregoing committees shall consist of not to exceed 15 members.

"SEC. 2. That the aforesaid committees shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed."

#### AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

Mr. OWEN. I ask that the bill (S. 1796) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the acts of August 4, 1914, August 15, 1914, March 3, 1915, and September 7, 1916, being Order of Business No. 12, be taken from the calendar and indefinitely postponed. The legislation therein contained has been enacted in another form.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be postponed indefinitely.

#### COL. E. M. HOUSE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I desire to read to the Senate a letter from my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, D. C., January 28, 1918.

HON. MORRIS SHEPPARD,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: As you are aware, in the debate in the Senate last Monday Senator PENROSE, of Pennsylvania, referred to Col. E. M. House, of Texas, as a lobbyist. Whatever may have been the purpose of such characterization, I am sure you will agree with me that it does Col. House a great injustice, which ought to be corrected by us, for it carries with it more or less opprobrium. As I do not yet feel justified in taking part in debates, I send you this letter to be used by you in such statement as you may see proper to make to the Senate on the subject.



I first became acquainted with Col. House in 1891, when James S. Hogg, to whom he was devotedly attached, was governor of Texas, and have known him intimately since then. During all this time, while he has taken an active part in the public affairs of our State, his conduct has been that of a patriotic citizen, and nothing has occurred to justify in the slightest degree the thought that he has ever been privately interested in legislation, which the term "lobbyist" would imply.

Very sincerely, yours,

C. A. CULBERSON.

Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] referred to Col. House on the occasion mentioned by my colleague as a politician. If to take a deep and intelligent interest in men and measures from the standpoint of the people's welfare, without a thought of self-advancement, makes one a politician, then Col. House is a politician, and may his kind increase. He has never sought office and has never held office.

The Senator from Pennsylvania referred to Col. House as a "lobbyist." This is an error of the most unqualified sort. Nothing in Col. House's life affords the slightest foundation for such a charge. He represents the highest type of the thoughtful, unobtrusive, patriotic, and public-spirited private citizen, a type that constitutes one of the glories of this Republic.

It is to the honor and the credit of Woodrow Wilson that he selected a plain, untitled, private citizen to represent this citizen-controlled Republic at the council table of world democracy.

REPORT OF THE EIGHT-HOUR COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 690).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In compliance with the provision of section 2 of the act of Congress approved September 3 and September 5, 1916, to establish an eight-hour day for employees of carriers engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, I transmit herewith the report of the commission appointed to observe the operation and effects of the institution of the eight-hour standard workday for railroad employees.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, 28 January, 1918.

#### THE CALENDAR.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed. The calendar, under Rule VIII, is in order. The Secretary will state the first bill on the calendar.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 1786) to amend certain sections of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. OVERMAN and Mr. GALLINGER. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 39) to appropriate \$3,000,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to prosecute the work of eradicating the southern cattle tick was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN and Mr. GALLINGER. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) authorizing the President to appoint two additional Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2180) to approve mutual cessions of territory by the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota and the consequent changes in the boundary line between said States was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2116) to increase the salary of the United States district attorney for the district of Rhode Island, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) authorizing the printing in one document the act to increase temporarily the Military Establishment, the registration regulations, and the proclamations of the President fixing June 5, 1917, as date of registration, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JAMES. Let that resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock meridian on Wednesday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, January 30, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, January 28, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We approach Thee, Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, with bowed heads and heavy hearts.

The responsibility thrust upon us is more than we can bear without divine aid, strength, courage to uphold and sustain us. The magnitude of the war which confronts us, the difficulties which must be overcome, are appalling; hence we pray most earnestly that a basis of peace may be reached upon which all the leading nations of the world can agree. Yet we realize that permanent peace can never come without a victory of principles which shall secure liberty and justice for all the peoples of all the world. Hear us, O Lord, and help us in this hour of distress, in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 26, 1918, was read and approved.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resignations from committees, which the Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, January 26, 1918.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK, Speaker,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the following committees: Claims, Education, Expenditures in the Department of Commerce, and Pensions.

Sincerely, yours,

DANIEL C. OLIVER.

WASHINGTON, January 25, 1918.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK, Speaker,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the following committees: Accounts; Expenditures in the Department of Labor; Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress; and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Sincerely, yours,

CLARENCE F. LEA.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

FILLING VACANCIES ON COMMITTEES.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the election of the following members of committees.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves the following nominations to committees. The Clerk will report them.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMITTEE NOMINATIONS.

BENJAMIN G. HUMPHREYS, of Mississippi, to be a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

CLARENCE F. LEA, of California, to be a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

DANIEL C. OLIVER, of New York, to be a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

WILLIAM C. WRIGHT, of Georgia, to be a member of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, and the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. Are there any other nominations? If not, the names appended to the paper just read will be appointed to the committees to which they are assigned.

The nominations were agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an article from a Baltimore paper announcing the death of the Hon. John Gill jr., my predecessor, from the fourth congressional district of Maryland.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

CARE OF BLIND SOLDIERS.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a statement made by Francis V. Brady, of Cleveland, Ohio, on how to care for the blind soldier.



The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the statement referred to:

WHAT THE Y. M. C. A. CAN DO FOR THE BLIND SOLDIER AFTER THE WAR.  
(By Francis V. Brady.)

To rehabilitate the blind soldier is a problem which should receive the careful consideration of every thinking man. His habits are already formed, his sphere in life has been attained, and his status is fixed, and then suddenly there comes a great change. From a world where he depends upon vision for what he wears, for what he eats, for the things of pleasure, for his livelihood, for everything, in fact, he is plunged into a world of darkness. His whole life must undergo a change to meet this new condition. His spirit is gone; his ambition has left him. He is utterly hopeless, and one asks the question: "What can be done for such a man?"

To outline briefly some phases of work which the association might profitably follow is the purpose of these notes.

#### I. WHAT CAN BE DONE IN THE HOSPITALS.

(a) To interview a man either at the hospital overseas, or at the hospital to which he has returned here in this country, just as soon as it is practical in order that his mind may be taken from the loss of his eyes and that he may be encouraged to think of the future not as a world of darkness and hopelessness, but as a world of sunshine where there is plenty of opportunity still waiting for the blind man who has the will and ambition to forge ahead.

(b) As quickly as possible teach him the fundamentals of raised print; especially the dot system used to mark playing cards and other games, so that he may learn to play games and thus occupy his time by touch.

(c) To provide readers who will read the best light literature.

(d) To see that friends who visit him do not discourage him; that they talk of the future only as a bright future; that, instead of sympathizing with the man, they cheer him up.

(e) To attempt to secure business men and others to discuss business problems and life problems, with the men always taking care to emphasize the ways in which a man who does not see can be useful.

#### II. WHAT CAN BE DONE IN THE HOME.

(a) If possible to visit the home before the arrival of the sightless soldier and prepare his parents or others for his coming, to try to leave the impression with them that he can be of much use in the world in spite of the fact that he is blind if they will do their share in maintaining his spirit and his grit.

(b) When the soldier has arrived, or before, if possible, to go to his associates and his neighbors and ask them to try, as far as possible, to treat him just as they did before he lost his sight, to associate with him just as freely, and to make him feel that he is just the same even though he has met a tremendous loss.

(c) To have his parents teach him to be as useful as possible in doing things about the home—for example, in the matter of eating, to teach him to cut his meat and wait on himself largely. When a man is a farmer or from a rural community, to teach him to care for the chickens, the pigs, or the cows, or to do the ordinary chores around the house.

(d) It is the duty of those at home to see that the man goes out as much as possible to lectures, theaters, church socials, clubs, and, in fact, everything which will keep him in touch with the outside world. It is because of the fact that many blind people are kept in the house and lose their contact with the outside world that much of the help that otherwise might be given them is lost.

#### III. WHAT THE CHURCH CAN DO.

(a) The minister or priest, as the case may be, should make it a point to visit the man and invite him to come to church, and in case he has no one to take him to provide a guide.

(b) To interest the members of the church in the man in order that they may make him feel that he is still one of them.

(c) To secure the active cooperation of the man in the Epworth League, the Christian Endeavor, the Young Men's Club, or whatever organization may be affiliated with the church.

#### IV. PHYSICAL EDUCATION.

(a) One of the things most needed by the blind soldiers is physical education. When one loses his sight, the tendency is to relax his muscles and allow many of them to become entirely useless. This can be avoided by proper physical training. Some of the institutions already have gymnasiums where instruction in calisthenics is given. But the Young Men's Christian Association can do much by opening its association buildings and establishing special classes where the blind may be taught gymnastics, swimming, skating, and various other athletic sports which will tend to give them much needed exercise and bring their unused muscles into play.

#### V. WHAT OCCUPATIONS CAN BLIND MEN FOLLOW SUCCESSFULLY?

This is one of the largest problems confronting those who are interested in the work for the blind soldiers. So far very little progress has been made in the last 30 or 40 years, in getting new occupations which blind people can follow successfully by those connected with institutions, but in individual cases blind men have demonstrated that there are few things they can not do if they have the will and the ambition to tackle the job. As near as possible, the blind soldier should be trained to do the thing he did before going into the Army. This may seem like a broad statement to ask a man to do the thing without his eyes that he did when he had full vision, but examination of psychological principles will demonstrate that a man who is proficient in one thing with the use of his eyes will readily acquire methods of doing the same thing by touch. This fact is illustrated by the man who lost his eyesight but continued to do a great deal of writing. He is able to write after some practice, probably not as well, but yet with some precision, simply by the use of his memory and his touch, so that it seems to me that if a blind soldier were a shoe clerk, for example, when he could see, he could easily adapt himself to conditions and become a successful shoe clerk even though he had lost his eyesight. If he were a machine operator when he could see, he could be taught to operate perhaps a simpler machine under present conditions.

With the idea in mind of having a blinded soldier follow as nearly as possible the occupation he followed when he had normal vision, we are passing to some of the occupations taught in blind institutions, and to some in which individual blind men have made a very marked success.

For your information I am giving, first, the occupations taught in institutions; and, second, those in which blind men, individually, have made a marked success.

(a) The following are the chief occupations taught in institutions: Broom making, weaving, chair caning, basket making, knitting and crocheting for women, mattress making, some manual training, and piano tuning.

With the exception of the last named, these occupations are done by hand, and must compete with similar products made by machinery, so that it is impossible for a blind man to make more than \$6 or \$8 a week, which in these days of high prices means a mere existence. For this reason a number of the States have enacted laws providing for commissions and pensions for the blind. Piano tuning is a different sphere. For the man who can do good work it provides an excellent opportunity for making a good living. The successful piano tuner can make from \$25 to \$40 a week if he works for a store or factory. With the advent of the player piano, however, the piano-repair work becomes more difficult, and it is only those blind men who have a mechanical bent who are able to master the intricacies of the various player pianos. These few men are very successful.

Many blind women and a few men become successful music teachers and musicians, but it is only after years of training, and in my mind it is hardly practical for those who become blind in adult years, for the reasons that their habits are formed, their fingers are stiff, and they do not acquire music as readily as younger boys and girls would. Type-writing and telephone operating have also been taught some in institutions, but practically no effort has been made to produce successful blind typists and telephone operators. For this reason I mention them in the second group of occupations rather than in the first.

2. (a) Occupations in which individual blind men have made a marked success:

A number of very successful lawyers have been blind. Some of these men have lost their sight in later life and have turned to the profession of law after losing their sight. In order to do this several qualities are necessary—first, a good education; second, an excellent memory; third, a clear, logical mind.

There have been a number of instances where blind men have made successful physicians. One of the most successful tuberculosis sanitariums in the country is conducted by a blind man at Monrovia, Cal. And still others have made a success as chiropractors and osteopaths. These two branches of the medical profession are especially adapted to blind men because they rely almost wholly upon touch for their results.

Another fruitful field of endeavor for blind people is that of insurance. If a man has known the insurance business before losing his sight, or if he has a pleasing personality and the ability to remember figures and forms of policies, there is no legitimate reason why the loss of one's eyes should be an insurmountable handicap to becoming a very successful writer of insurance. Many of the large companies already have employed blind people, and they have shown that they are very capable of producing results, which are what all commercial concerns are after.

Salesmanship: This is a field in which adult blind men have taken hold and have made wonderful success. I have in mind two men of my acquaintance who lost their eyesight by accident when they were up in years, one of whom operates a large furniture house, and the other is the most successful salesman for a large paint and varnish concern in the city of Cleveland. These men were both blinded in middle life and had to readapt themselves to their new conditions. This is a very productive field for blind men.

Typewriting: I have known of several cases where both blind men and women have made a marked success in the operation of the typewriter. With the use of the dictaphone so common, I see no reason why this should not be done more.

Telephone operating: I have known of a number of men and women who have successfully mastered a switchboard, and with the use of the buzzer system this should be very easily taught.

Telegraphy: I have known of two telegraph operators, but they did nothing but receive. It would be difficult for blind men to send and receive, because of the reading involved; but I see no reason why they should not be taught the Morse code and the wireless code and become successful receiving operators with the aid of a typewriter.

Machine operators: I know of five blind men in various parts of the country who are working in factories operating lathes, drilling presses, milling machines, armature winders, and other machines. With the modern safety appliances now in use in factories and with the introduction of almost fool-proof automatic machines I see no reason why blind men should not operate successfully many machines in factories, especially where they were used to such work before entering the Army.

Executives: I know of many large business institutions which are managed by blind men. One of the largest factories in Chicago has for its owner a blind man who lost his sight when he was 30 years old. A large undertaking concern in Cleveland has for its manager a blind man who lost his sight when he was about 22. A bank and a department store of which I know have for their owners and managers blind men. Senator Gore and Congressman SCHALL and Fitzpatrick have demonstrated what blind men who lose their sight in their youth can do as executives and leaders.

This is but a partial list of occupations, but it is sufficient to illustrate the variety of callings in which blind men have made a marked success. There is no valid reason why any or all of these occupations should not be made use of in training the boys who come home without their sight from the battle field of Europe.

#### VI. WHAT CAN THE PUBLIC DO?

(a) The big thing is to treat the blind soldier with the same consideration you treated him before he went to war. I have known of many men and women who are in social work who are very courteous and very nice to blind men and women when they are in that work, but when they are outside of their work they seem to shun them. They seem to feel that there is somehow a difference because of the fact that the man or woman has lost his or her eyesight. The big thing to try to impress upon the public is that when a man loses his sight it does not change his ways of life; he should not change his attitude of mind, and it should not change the attitude of the public toward him. The blind man has the same passions, the same ideas, the same ambition, and the same aspirations as the people who see him, and the public should recognize this fact and accord him the same courtesy, the same consideration, and the same respect as they would a seeing brother. Fraternal organizations and clubs who have blind soldiers among their membership should see to it that these men are on committees; that they are called upon to talk; that they are given offices, and given the same things that they received before they went to France.



The attitude of the public to-day is one of pity. This is so because of long years of education along that line. The Bible refers to blind men as beggars. Shakespeare treats the blind man as a hopeless being, incapable of doing a man's work in a community. Modern literature likewise sympathizes and pities the blind. It is for this reason that it is so hard for one who has lost his sight, who can really do things, to get an opportunity to show just what he can do. It is for this reason that blind men and women are looked upon as beings from another world, and it is this attitude of the public which the Young Men's Christian Association can do much to change in its dealings with blind soldiers.

LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY, FEBRUARY 12.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Lincoln's birthday, the 12th of February, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] be allowed to address the House for 30 minutes on the life of President Lincoln.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—I am not going to object, of course—for four or five years past I have on that day, with the permission of the House, read Lincoln's Gettysburg address, and I ask that I be permitted to read that address first and then let the gentleman from Illinois follow.

Mr. GILLET. I am quite willing to accept that as an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that on Lincoln's birthday, February 12, after the reading of the Journal and the clearing up of business on the Speaker's table, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] read Lincoln's Gettysburg speech, and that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] be then permitted to address the House not to exceed 30 minutes; of course, not to interfere with conference reports and privileged business. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9054) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, with Mr. CRISP in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9054. When the committee rose at its last sitting there was pending an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Page 13, line 19, strike out the figures "\$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Under agreement of the committee, debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto was limited to two hours, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] to control one hour of that time and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] the other hour. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I expect now to occupy only five minutes. The amendment I have offered, if adopted, would increase the amount of money available to the Bureau of Animal Industry for the work of eradicating tuberculosis in live stock. Several speeches, all good, were delivered a few days ago in general debate, showing the general prevalence of tuberculosis in live stock, how it is growing and spreading, the extent of the loss and damage, and the danger also to human life.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that as my time is so limited I should confine myself to a statement as to how this matter arose and the status of it as it comes before the House. Some gentlemen, particularly interested in the subject, had interviewed the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, Dr. Mohler, as to whether or not the disease of tuberculosis in live stock could be eradicated. He replied, stating without qualification, that it could be eradicated. He was asked further how much money his bureau could properly and economically expend

during the coming year in carrying on that work, and he said he could use \$1,000,000.

The fact was called to his attention that many veterinarians would be required and that many of them are now being employed by the Government of the United States, enlisted in the military service, and he was asked if, in view of that situation, he would be able to obtain the veterinarians needed. He said: "Yes; I can obtain the veterinarians. I can get the men if the money suggested is appropriated for the purpose."

Later the Secretary of Agriculture recommended the appropriation of only \$250,000, and stated that that is all the money that can be profitably and properly used during the coming year. I have great respect for the Secretary of Agriculture. I esteem him as one of the great men in this administration, and I hesitate to differ from him.

In fact, I think I do not differ from him, believing that he has made this statement having in view the necessity of other large appropriations and the need of economy, and believing, too, that he would prefer that this matter should be put up to, considered, and settled by Congress, rather than that he alone should determine the amount of money that should be appropriated. And if I may be permitted to choose between the eminent Secretary of Agriculture and the chief of his bureau as to the amount of money that can be properly used, I may be pardoned if I choose to follow the chief of the bureau, who knows the work, has been engaged in it, and knows the kind of work that he will carry on. Under him will be the employment of the men and the use of the entire sum. He says, without qualification, that \$1,000,000 can be used. Mr. Chairman, he made that statement to two of the Members of this House before the matter was taken up by the Secretary of Agriculture, and in justice to him it should be said that he holds to his original statement in spite of the statement made by the Secretary.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I prefer not to yield now. My time is so limited. In that condition the matter came up before the Committee on Agriculture, and a recommendation was made that only \$250,000 should be appropriated for this work. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that my amendment, which would carry \$500,000, ought to be adopted. Tuberculosis in cattle has increased in the last 10 years from 0.58 per cent to 3.35 per cent, and in the slaughterhouses where swine are slaughtered the percentage of animals found to be affected with tuberculosis during the year 1916 runs from 3 per cent to 24 per cent. A large part of the cattle slaughtered in these houses come from the ranges, and the large areas of the country, where the disease has not been so prevalent as in other parts and where conditions are not such as to encourage and permit its spread. Think, then, of the condition that must exist among the dairy herds that are largely confined and kept under conditions which encourage the development of tuberculosis.

The chief of the bureau says:

Tuberculosis can be eradicated from all the cattle and all the swine in this Union; otherwise the Department of Agriculture would not have embarked upon such a tempestuous campaign. To support such a broad assertion there is abundant evidence obtained from the school of experience covering a period of several years.

He goes on to give the names of the States in which the work has been successfully carried on and in which tuberculosis has been practically, if not altogether, eradicated. He says—

Furthermore, wherever and whenever an effort was made to eradicate the plague and the earnest cooperation of the live-stock owners and officials has thus been obtained, success has never failed to crown the enterprise.

Herds of cattle which have at the inception of the campaign contained 75 per cent of diseased animals have been freed of the malady and have remained as free herds.

Herds which on the first test were found free of disease have, by the prudent care of their owners, been kept free of tuberculosis.

The experience the department has had, as outlined here, has been enjoyed by the veterinary officials of some States. The preponderance of successful experiments, if we may call them such, is convincing proof that when conditions are favorable tuberculosis may be eradicated.

He says also:

The American people can eradicate tuberculosis, or prevent its eradication, or increase its presence.

In 1907, the bureau first undertook systematic investigations in regard to the eradication of bovine tuberculosis, and the results which have been obtained through 10 years of study indicate that the eradication of tuberculosis of cattle and swine is probably the largest and most difficult problem which the bureau has undertaken to solve for the benefit of the live-stock industry and the general public, which benefits from the advancement of that industry.

And he goes on to say that it is a demonstration and not a theory, not an experiment, that the disease can be eradicated, and under proper care when once eradicated it does not again appear.

Mr. Chairman, the interest of the membership of the House in this subject of tuberculosis in live stock has been revived



and greatly aroused by facts brought to their attention by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN], who has, in his usual intelligent and thorough manner, elicited facts and figures showing the prevalence and rapid spread of that plague, and that it can be eradicated. He seems to have been able also to attract the attention and arouse the interest of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the chief of that bureau, adopting the suggestion made to him by Mr. SLOAN that an appropriation of \$1,000,000 ought to be made, promises, and I am sure will inaugurate and carry on a vigorous campaign for the eradication of tuberculosis. Everyone who knows existing conditions will welcome that campaign, and State authorities will give prompt and effective assistance in carrying it on.

Let the work begin at once and let there be abundance of money available to enable officials of the department to carry it on properly and to a successful end. I trust my amendment increasing the appropriation by \$250,000 will be agreed to.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman consumed nine minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER].

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, this item in the bill is a new item. It carries an appropriation of \$250,000. The committee gave to this matter full and thorough investigation, had a hearing upon this specific proposition, and gave full consideration to everything that was suggested in reference to it.

Nobody denies that this condition exists throughout the country, and that it ought to be remedied. We are anxious to do what can be done in that direction; but we all recognize the fact, or at least ought to recognize the fact, that you can not accomplish everything in a day; that it takes some time to accomplish anything, no matter what you may undertake and to make proper preparation to begin the work. We sought the very best information that could possibly be obtained in reference to the facts as to conditions throughout the country, and what could be done to reach an effective remedy in the most efficient manner in the shortest possible time. Wanting information upon this subject, and desiring it from the source which we believed could give us the best information to be obtained, we went to the Secretary of Agriculture himself, and he recommended the sum carried in this bill, \$250,000. The Secretary of Agriculture advised the committee that in his opinion the department could effectively use \$250,000 during the next fiscal year. Now, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] says that the chief of the bureau says that he can use \$1,000,000. Well, we all know that the chiefs of these bureaus are anxious at all times to enlarge their activities, and that they advise us sometimes that they can use a great deal more than the Secretaries of these executive departments oftentimes believe they can use advantageously or ought to be permitted to use. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] says that as between the Secretary of Agriculture and the chief of this bureau in this instance he would take the advice of the chief of the bureau. I prefer, and I believe it is wise, to take the advice of the Secretary of Agriculture, the head of this department, as to what can be done and as to the most effective way in which it can be done.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I have only a very little time remaining.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman tell us to what extent the States cover this question of tuberculous cattle? What do the States themselves do?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The States themselves at present are doing practically nothing along this line of work. They depend upon the Government, like they often do in reference to other matters, to do the whole work.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. My information is that many of the States are exercising a great deal of care and spending a great deal of money for this purpose.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Yes; in quarantine work. They are supposed to exercise all the activities they can along that line, but when it comes to expending money outside for the purpose of eradicating the disease and going to the root of it, they are not doing anything along that line.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I regret I can not. I have but five minutes. Now, as I understand the amendment, it seems to me that we ought to take the advice of the Secretary himself, and while the work is a good work and I want it distinctly understood I favor it, and it ought to be done and will be done, nevertheless, we should go about it in a businesslike way of utilizing what the Secretary of Agriculture says can be utilized effectively in order to bring about the best results. If we at-

tempt to go beyond that we stand a chance of not utilizing the money effectively and of wasting the money in an effort which can not be directed in the proper course because the machinery to secure best results is not available at present. Therefore I believe that the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan increasing the appropriation ought not to be adopted, and that you should stand by the best judgment of the committee which brought in this report unanimously, and by the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture, and that you should stand by the amount specified in the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKINLEY].

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I come from an agricultural district. The farmers of my district have the highest appreciation of the work of the Department of Agriculture. I find the department always willing to help for the benefit of the people of central Illinois. Therefore, I want to uphold their hands in every way. It is hard when we juggle the great figures of to-day, the immense appropriations, to appreciate the vast amount of funds going to different departments of the Government, and it is only by comparison that we can judge of the proportion that each department gets. For instance, the Department of Agriculture this year will receive in this bill about \$27,000,000. We appropriate for one battle cruiser upward of \$30,000,000, more than the Department of Agriculture will get for agriculture in all the United States. We know that one battle cruiser can not go across the ocean unless food is furnished. All over the United States we have appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars to be expended for temporary cantonments on rented lands. We pay eight or ten million dollars for one camp, while we are only appropriating \$27,000,000 for the whole Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much impressed when the statement was made before our committee that 15 per cent of all the hogs slaughtered in Chicago were affected by tuberculosis; that 24 per cent of all the hogs slaughtered at Milwaukee were affected by tuberculosis. The information was given to us that tuberculosis originates in cattle and then spreads to the hogs in the country. We were informed that if it was eliminated from the cattle it would be eliminated from the hogs.

Again, comparisons are what we must judge by. We are told that there are 20,000,000 head of cattle in the United States subject to the cattle tick. The department will receive this year in this appropriation bill some \$600,000 for the elimination of the cattle tick. I know that they will use it properly, and it has been of great benefit to the country. There are 20,000,000 cattle subject to the cattle tick and 130,000,000 cattle and hogs subject to tuberculosis. If the same proportion of appropriation was made there would be provided in the bill some \$4,000,000 in the elimination of tuberculosis from the cattle and hogs instead of the \$250,000 provided in the bill, or the \$500,000 asked for in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Taking into consideration, gentlemen, the fact, which I will repeat again, that 15 per cent of the hogs slaughtered in Chicago, the greatest packing district in the United States, and 24 per cent of those slaughtered in Milwaukee are affected with tuberculosis, it certainly seems to me very important indeed that we should give to the Department of Agriculture a liberal sum for the elimination of tuberculosis, and I hope that this committee will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan increasing the appropriation—not to \$4,000,000, which would be the proportion that they ought to have, but to \$500,000. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I heartily agree with the gentleman from Illinois, who has spoken with reference to the importance of this Government undertaking to deal with the disease of tuberculosis among cattle. The gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from Michigan will find no quarrel with me as to the great importance of the subject matter involved, because I have the honor to represent in part a State which produces eight times as many cattle as any other State in the Union, and when this question is broached it touches my State, with its 8,000,000 head of cattle. While I recognize the importance of the item, I also recognize the fundamental principle that ought to underlie every appropriation that this Congress makes, and that is the business principle, "Don't give any money unless you know that you have the appropriate machinery to spend that money effectively." [Applause.] We have not got that machinery, and we must depend upon the Department of Agriculture to furnish that machinery in due time. They tell us now that they can not get veterinarians, because



the war has made a great demand upon these professional people, and that they are not to be had. When the question is asked them for their best judgment on every dollar that they can legitimately use in the next fiscal year, they respond that \$250,000 is every single cent that can be used.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Not now; I have not the time. They are the people who are going to spend the money. That question has been asked more than once. It is said in an indirect way that the chief of the bureau tells us that they can use \$1,000,000. He made no such statement before the Committee on Agriculture, on which committee action must be had, and that statement was never made in that committee. If you enter the field of destroying cattle and hogs that are afflicted with this disease, and undertake to pay for destroying the cattle, \$10,000,000 can easily be expended. But what are we, as the Committee on Agriculture, called on to do? Here is a great problem which is now being attacked. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKINLEY] refers to the cattle-tick item. I believe it was in 1906 that less than \$100,000 was the first appropriation on that item. If you had then made an appropriation of a million dollars to attack that problem, which was a serious one, that million dollars would have been wasted, and we would not have been advanced any further than we are at this time. It takes time to educate people and to organize and to get these matters before the country, and you have got to have the cooperation of the people and of the legislatures of the respective States.

We did not make any headway in the cattle-tick item until an educational campaign was carried on, and when that campaign was had and we woke the people up to the problem that confronted them, the legislatures of the several States enacted laws compelling the dipping of their cattle, and by 1921 we hope the entire South will be free from this evil. But we went about it in a systematic way. We used a small appropriation at first. We enlarged this as demands and organization came, and we have obtained results by that enlargement. It was just the same with this tuberculosis item. I am ready to enlarge it when we get the organization; I am ready to spend every dollar that can be legitimately expended just as fast as the subject matter can be brought to the attention of the people of the country; and I am as intensely interested in stamping out this disease from among our cattle and hogs as any gentleman on the floor of this House. But we must do it in a businesslike, systematic way.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. May I ask my colleague if any other method for the treatment of tuberculosis in cattle has been discovered or is resorted to than the slaughtering of the afflicted herds?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. That is the only way that has been found by which you can destroy it, and I have but to call the attention of the gentlemen of the House to this fact: This same disease is in the human family, and millions of dollars have been expended all over the country endeavoring to eradicate it, but we have not been able to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to direct what I have to say to the proposition that the States are doing something toward the eradication of tuberculosis, and that it is possible, by the use of proper administrative measures and by proper legislation, to eradicate the disease. But the States can not do it by themselves. This is not a State problem; it is a national problem. No State can keep itself clean from tuberculosis, no matter how efficiently its laws may be enforced, unless similar legislation, similar administration, is enforced in the States which surround it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have only a minute, but I yield for a question.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I could not do it in a minute.

Mr. ANDERSON. I can not give the gentleman more time.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I only wanted to ask a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman says that by proper legislation tuberculosis in cattle can be eliminated.

Mr. ANDERSON. And by enforcement of the law.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I would like to know how. Have the scientists discovered any method of treating it effectively except to destroy the herds?

Mr. ANDERSON. And by segregation.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman means letting the climate cure them?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. Minnesota was one of the first States to undertake the eradication of tuberculosis. I think more efficient work has been done there than in any other State. We have been in this work since 1904, and I desire to present some figures as to what has been accomplished in that State with a view of demonstrating that it is possible to eradicate tuberculosis. In 1911 in the State of Minnesota 4,405 cattle were tested. Three thousand five hundred and three of these cattle had been previously tested and the reactors segregated or destroyed, and of the number previously tested only nine-tenths of 1 per cent were found to be affected. As to those upon whom the first test was applied, 16 per cent were found to be affected. In 1916, of 4,700 cattle previously tested, only eight one-hundredths of 1 per cent of the cattle were found to be affected. Of those upon whom the first test was made, 9.5 per cent were found to be affected. In 1917, of 7,279 cattle previously tested, there was not found a single reactor. Of 2,193, which were then tested for the first time, 10 per cent were found to be affected with tuberculosis. But the singular thing and the impressive thing in connection with this test is this, that as to the 2,193 cattle that were tested for the first time, of which 10 per cent were found to be reactors, it was found that of this 10 per cent 60 per cent were imported into the State.

In three months of 1917-18, 3,225 cattle were retested. Of this number four one-hundredths of 1 per cent were found to be reactors, while of 329 tested the first time 15 per cent reacted, and of those 50 per cent came from other States. From 1902 to 1910, 122,978 cattle were tested, of which 7.8 per cent reacted. From 1910 to 1917, 248,586 cattle were tested, and of this number 3.7 per cent reacted. In other words, these figures show a progressive decrease in the number of cattle affected with tuberculosis in the State of Minnesota, and they show that the cattle that reacted from the test were very largely imported from other States. The logical conclusion of these statistics is that no State can effectively cope with this problem unless it is made a national problem and unless every State undertakes to eradicate tuberculosis. It is not a State problem. Just now it is more peculiarly a northern problem, but the South is about going into the cattle business. Much of its pure-bred stock will have to come from the North, and the South is therefore just as much interested in seeing that tuberculosis is eradicated in the northern herds as the northern people themselves, because their problem will be greatly increased in difficulty if infected cattle from the North are imported into the South for breeding purposes. Now, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] suggests no difficulty in finding men to carry on the work of eradicating the pink bollworm, for which we propose to spend \$500,000. He found no difficulty last year in finding men to accept the pay under the item for the eradication of the southern cattle tick, and many of those men are veterinarians. Why should he insist that men can not be found to carry on this work? Twenty States, to-day, by law, require tests of cattle and the destruction of those which are found to be absolute reactors. In 15 of these States compensation is paid by the State up as high as, I think, to three-fourths of the value. In other States, while it does not specifically provide for compensation, of course compensation could be obtained. No effective work can be done anywhere unless provision is made for compensation for cattle slaughtered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. FOSTER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message, in writing, from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, informed the House of Representatives that the President had on January 26, 1918, approved and signed bills of the following titles:

H. R. 6176. An act extending the time for the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near the city of Fairmont, W. Va.; and

H. R. 7697. An act to authorize the calling into the service of the United States militia and other locally created armed forces in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. LEVER. Let me inquire of the gentleman from Michigan how many speeches he has?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I have several more applications than I can accommodate.

Mr. LEVER. I suggest that the gentleman take one more speech now.



Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is not my intention to take very much time of the committee this morning, but I want to call particular attention to the subject of tuberculosis in cattle as strong as it is possible for me in language to do. You know I have been studying this question for the past two years, and I am thoroughly convinced that if there is one thing that Congress ought to do and do quickly it is to eradicate tuberculosis in cattle in this great country of ours. Why should we be appropriating to eliminate all kinds of pests and diseases, worthy as those appropriations are, and neglecting to appropriate for the eradication of tuberculosis, when scientists all tell us that a large part of the tuberculosis in the human race is caused by impure milk from tubercular cattle? Why should we stand idly by and see 6,000 children a year die of bovine tuberculosis while we appropriate some \$600,000 for the boll weevil and hundreds of thousands of dollars for hog cholera and thousands of dollars for the eradication of cattle tick and all these other things, though, as I say, they each and every one are worthy and are necessary? Yet we stand by talking and parleying over the appropriation of a little more money which means life for the children of this country, more largely perhaps than for grown people, although it means the life of grown people as well. We all know that milk and milk products go to the stomachs of the children of this Nation in their raw state. There is no cooked process about them. We have granted a meat inspection—a very wise and worthy law—but you know that the meat that goes into the human stomach goes in there in a cooked state, and yet here is milk, butter, and cheese, carrying tuberculosis germs from 2,000,000 cattle, going into the stomachs of children and grown people of this country in a raw state; and we stand here and talk as if we could not appropriate more than \$250,000 because some one says that some man in the Agricultural Department says—

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have only five minutes. If you will give me additional time, I will.

Mr. COX. I want to know how many cattle have tuberculosis?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Two million cattle of this country have tuberculosis.

Mr. COX. Does that mean milch cows?

Mr. LINTHICUM. The milch cows of this country. We have 22,000,000 of cattle in this country, and that means about 1 to every 10 of the cows of this country are spreading the disease germs of tuberculosis. We stand here and say we can not give \$500,000 to carry on this work. I had a talk with Dr. Mohler, and he said if you will give \$1,000,000 he can put men at work eradicating this disease in the next few years, but if you only give \$250,000 he can only go about it in the present slow process; that if he had \$1,000,000 he could send men to stir up the States, that he could employ persons to go before the people and let them know that this thing ought to be eradicated, and that he could use \$1,000,000 with great efficiency. In the long run it will not cost the United States any more, because you merely hold it down with \$250,000, whereas you can proceed to eliminate it with \$1,000,000.

Now, I do not wish to go into the vast details of this matter, as I have not the time; but you have read my remarks, and you know that there are some hundreds of labor clubs of this country, some hundred women's organizations in this country, and numerous other clubs, aggregating several hundred, which have indorsed this proposition, and those indorsements have been filed in Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I ask for two minutes more.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. LINTHICUM. There are some hundreds of clubs which have passed resolutions asking Congress to eradicate tuberculosis. Now, gentlemen, I sincerely hope this committee will vote to give us certainly the \$500,000; but we ought to have \$1,000,000 in order that we may get to work to eradicate the trouble. What is the use of being compelled to pasteurize milk and to cure the disease germs when you can go to the root of the evil and eradicate tuberculosis and have the milk pure? Instead of that, we go along with impure milk and go to work pasteurizing it, just as in cities that had impure and muddy water—we would boil the water. What did we do then? We put in great plants to purify the water before it went into the homes. Let us appropriate enough money to purify this milk and eradicate tuberculosis and save 6,000 babies in this country every year. I tell you, as I told you on Friday, that we talk about conservation of food and fuel, and this, that, and the

other; but one thing above all others ought to be conserved, and that is the human white race on this earth—with this great war going on and killing off thousands of white people every day and every month, while the other races are propagating. Instead of conserving our race we allow bovine tuberculosis to kill 6,000 babies each year. What I want to say is that you should eradicate tuberculosis, and thereby conserve the human race, so that these children will not be killed off by bovine tuberculosis. Now is the time to do it by voting for this amendment and telling the Bureau of Animal Industry to get busy and eradicate the evil.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, there is nobody of the mind to disagree about what the gentleman has said as to the eradication of tuberculosis in live stock. The question is, How are we to get at that eradication? The Committee on Agriculture is as anxious to eradicate tuberculosis in milk and in live stock as any other group of men on the globe, but we must be guided by what the Department of Agriculture, which has to spend this money, has to say about what they can do with the money that we give them. We have already provided in this bill \$50,000 more for the eradication of tuberculosis than the department estimated for. We have provided in the bill, in giving \$250,000 for eradication of tuberculosis, the maximum amount that any witness appearing before our committee testified they could reasonably spend during the next fiscal year. An effort was made by leading questions to get witnesses from the department who know how the money is going to be spent to say that they could use \$500,000 or \$1,000,000, and not one would say that they could use over \$250,000. Therefore the committee can not take the people's money and throw it to the winds. If the department can not spend this money in a legitimate way and in an effective way, why should we give them money which they do not want and which they can not use? The Committee on Agriculture is liberal. It wants the department to have every cent it can use, but when they can not use it why appropriate it?

Mr. LOBECK. Does not the gentleman think that they were very moderate in their demands, considering the largeness of the proposition?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I think they were moderate; yes. I hoped they would say they could use \$1,000,000.

Mr. LOBECK. Do not the departments usually ask for more than they want?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Sometimes they do. And the estimates in this case seem to be moderate. But witnesses appeared before our committee, and the maximum that any man would state was that they could use but \$250,000.

Now, there were reasons for that. One of the reasons is that there is a great shortage of veterinarians, as my friend from Nebraska knows.

Mr. LOBECK. That is true.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. The Government at this minute wants 2,000 veterinarians and is unable to get them.

Mr. LOBECK. If they were willing to pay them a fair salary, they could get them, could they not?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I think not, because you can not make a veterinarian overnight. They have to go through several years in training.

The department is not opposed to the proposition. It wants to make the eradication of tuberculosis complete, but it can not do it with money alone. The department can not turn the money loose unless they have some way to spend it, and they do not want to spend it in a useless procedure by giving it to some men or giving it to clerks down here in the department. They might bring in a bunch of clerks and let them warm the seats and pay them good salaries, but that would not be an eradication of tuberculosis.

Mr. LOBECK. The reason they do not get the good men to-day in the Bureau of Animal Industry is because those men get more pay in other lines.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. That is not the question here.

Mr. LOBECK. You are in favor of a large appropriation?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I am in favor of as large an appropriation as the department can spend to good advantage.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Was not Dr. Mohler absent on that day the gentleman refers to? Was he not absent in the West?

Mr. LEVER. Dr. Mohler made a statement on the subject. But on the day referred to he was not there.

Mr. LINTHICUM. So far as the veterinarians are concerned, I had a veterinarian of 10 years' practice, and asked them to take him, but they said they had more applications than they needed and could not take him on.



Mr. DOOLITTLE. Appointments are made under the civil-service regulations.

The gentleman is mistaken about the scarcity of veterinarians in the department.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not know. That is what they told me. That is all I know.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] a few moments ago, I notice, conceded the magnitude of the evil of tuberculosis and the necessity for the remedy, but, as I gathered from what he said and from what has just been said by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOOLITTLE], the trouble is they have not the people who would go ahead and do this work. Well, if the evil is so acknowledged and the necessity so great, when we have appropriated the money we shall have done our duty, and then it is up to them. If half a million dollars is not enough, then let us make it \$2,000,000. If they can not hire veterinarians to do this work with what they have now, let us give them some more. Here is one of the greatest evils that threatens this country, one of the greatest dangers that has menaced it, and 20 States are working at it now.

I have seen this House spend \$600,000,000 in two hours' time without batting an eye and without ever getting an answer to a question as to what it was for, except the general proposition; and yet when a man comes in here and wants you to grant \$500,000 to fight tuberculosis you say you can not get the men necessary to do the work. Why, this \$500,000 would only employ 330 men. By giving the money you can have them go out and get the men. You can not find 300 veterinarians!

This bill appropriates \$620,000 for the eradication of the southern cattle tick; for promoting standards and investigating the ginning, baling, compressing, and tare of cotton, \$45,000; for farmers' cooperative demonstration and for the demonstration of the best methods of meeting the ravages of the cotton boll weevil, \$650,000; to keep the Mexican pink bollworm of cotton in Mexico out of the United States and survey him on his native heath in Mexico, \$100,000; to make the aforesaid pink Mexican bollworm an outlaw on all lands and seas, to be killed at sight, \$400,000. Here is \$1,815,000 to be expended in the cotton belt, including the area of the Texas cattle tick. Evidently there is ample supply of men for this business. Then I find that you have appropriated \$250,000 to stamp out tuberculosis in cattle; and when the gentleman from Michigan modestly asks you for \$500,000 we are gravely told that there are not men enough in the United States to be had on whom could be expended half a million dollars to fight against the ravages of a disease which not only assails dumb brutes and cotton patches, but is a standing menace to every home in the United States. If everybody in the cotton belt in civil life is going to put in his time running down the Mexican bollworm and the Mexican cattle tick, we will have no gentlemen from that territory to fight the tuberculosis.

But will this not open the way for the employment in civil life of somebody north of the Ohio River? Have not the gentlemen so confined their employment of civilians to the cotton belt that they wholly overlook the fact that in the cow country and the wheat country and the corn country there are many good men of both political parties who could be persuaded for a consideration to enlist under the Government flag in helping the Agricultural Department? The terrific menace which tuberculosis is has of itself forced a demand for and a supply of veterinarians such as was never before known, and every man in Congress knows that the statement we can not secure enough veterinarians to draw salaries amounting to \$500,000 for investigating the dairy cattle of this country is absolutely without any foundation whatever. I can state without fear of successful challenge that if every dollar of the \$1,815,000 appropriated for the cotton-belt ticks and worms were turned over to the fight against tuberculosis it would improve this bill 100 per cent. The people of South Carolina do not milk enough cows to have any serious appreciation of what it means to a dairy country to fight tuberculosis.

Last year Swift & Co. sold \$875,000,000 worth of meat products. The Armour's sold in this country \$575,000,000 worth of meat products. Last year Swifts cleared \$32,000,000 and Armour's in the United States \$21,000,000 selling meats. Armour made 2.21 per cent, Swift 3.7 per cent on every dollar of sales. The Armour's cleared 21 per cent on their capital stock and, they state, 14½ per cent on their net capital. Besides their foreign holdings Armour's had at the close of last year a capital

stock of \$100,000,000 and a surplus of \$56,000,000. Their bills and accounts payable had risen from \$41,000,000 to \$101,000,000 in that year. Their balance sheet showed as resources \$314,000,000 in the meat-packing business. From those figures you can begin to get an idea of the immensity of the cattle trade and its evils that attack us and the broad spread it makes among the people. Those facts in themselves should be enough to induce the House to be liberal in such a thing as this.

Within the last half century I have myself seen this great industry spring from nothing under my eyes. When I went to the district which I now have the honor to represent here, Kansas was a cattle country, a buffalo-cattle country. The frontier village in which I resided, far from a railroad, had in every other home a buffalo robe and every season buffalo meat for sale in the butcher shops. A neighbor kept a buffalo calf in his yard. In a spirit of scientific research once, at the mature age of 12, I hurried along a bunch of buffalo with a stick, just to see what could be done, and older men have hurried them all away as carelessly. That such a change could come in a lifetime seems almost incredible. What will it be hereafter?

As they disappeared the longhorns came across the Indian Territory from Texas. Infested with the Spanish fever and the Mexican tick, they were not allowed to be driven into Arkansas and Missouri. Accumulating in vast numbers at the close of the Civil War, after the Confederate Army market terminated, one year, in the late seventies, Capt. King and the other big cattlemen started hundreds of thousands of them across the prairie headed for the Kansas Pacific Railroad, just built toward Denver. A shrewd man, Joe McCoy, secured a contract with the Kansas Pacific, built stockyards at Abilene, where I long lived, staked out a line of travel from the Arkansas River crossings toward his stockyards, erected signs, and the whole Texas trade landed at Abilene as seamen find a safe harbor. For several years that little village was the greatest cattle mart in the world, while Wild Bill reigned as marshal and monarch. Then the longhorn passed away in the wake of the buffalo, and they brought in the little round cows from the East and England, and tuberculosis and dairy farms and creameries, and established where I now reside a packing house whose firm this year put out almost a billion dollars of packed meats to go into millions of homes. Do not quibble about getting a few men. This is a big proposition, gentlemen, and I hope you can think of it in a big way. Will you permit the great future of this trade to be undermined by this dread enemy unchallenged while you run down the pink bollworm and the boll weevil that are only injurious to crops, not life?

The second Kansas district supplies more foodstuffs to the world than any other district in the United States. We are second in packing-house industries, and second in flour milling industries, and we have eight large agricultural counties besides. You have just shown your thoughtfulness for the wheat farmers out there by cutting off 20 per cent or so of the price of the farmer's wheat. But he does not grumble. You did not cut it off of cotton. You did not reduce the price of arms or ammunition, nor of any great product but wheat. When you have attempted to remedy the evils that attack cotton we did not quibble. I hope you will stop a moment and think about the people from whom you have taken 20 per cent from the price of wheat. You did not do that in the case of the cotton farmer, but you might just as well have done it with the one as with the other. The price of cotton was comparatively higher than that of wheat. You hear very little in the way of complaint from the wheat farmers.

These men settled on raw prairie and after years of mortgages and droughts finally reached to a place where the world was coming their way and they were getting the best end of the market. This Congress, that does not "cotton" to wheat, found it necessary to take 20 or 25 per cent from the value of the wheat that the farmers were holding for the advantages of the market, that have come to every factory and wholesale house in the Republic, and have covered every cotton field deep with yellow gold. Why should you take 20 per cent from the wheat farmer? If you had said to every man with over a million dollars, "turn into the Government, sacrifice to the war measures, 20 per cent of your accumulated holdings, it would have caused not one-fourth of the distress, but a thousand times the outcry that the wheat farmers made. Oh, the wheat farmer can place his savings by the side of his son as he goes into battle, but nobody dreamed of saying that to the millionaire and his capital. Now, when you are spending a million and a half on the cotton fields, when you put \$600,000 to running down the cattle tick, half extinguished now, you rise in astonishment that we ask a paltry half million to give the country sanitary milk, butter, and meat, sound stock in the pasture by the wheat field. It ought to be \$10,000,000!



The western agriculturalist is a diversified industrialist. He scarcely said a thing when he was told that it was for the interests of his country that he sacrifice. Is there no balm in Gilead? Now, comes the farmer and leads the old cow up to the rack, and says, "Here, she has got tuberculosis; take a crack at that while you spend \$600,000 on the cattle tick."

All you need to do is to take Mohler's word. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] both have had the same experience with Dr. Mohler. He tells us through them that he can eventually cut out tuberculosis in live stock for a million dollars if given now to begin a system. If a man asks for a billion here, he is trusted at sight. If he only asks for a million, you view him with suspicion. You have taken the word of everybody that came here without any hesitation when they were asking for hundreds of millions of dollars, and when Dr. Mohler comes up and says, by the mouths of the gentleman from Maryland and the gentleman from Michigan, that if you give him a million dollars he will begin a policy that will eradicate tuberculosis, why quibble about a matter like that? He is either right or wrong. You could not spend your money to better purpose. Why not try it?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. If either the gentleman from Michigan or the gentleman from Maryland says that Dr. Mohler stated to them positively that he would agree to eradicate tuberculosis in live stock for a million dollars, I will agree to it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not think he said he would agree to eradicate it for a million dollars, but he said he could begin to eradicate it for a million dollars.

Mr. LITTLE. Well, I will stand on the record of what the gentleman from Maryland says. If he can begin to eradicate it, that is sufficient for me. Your bill, this bill, provides \$620,000 for the "eradication of the southern cattle tick." You mean to work toward the eradication, and will want more money next year. Mohler, of course, meant to inaugurate a policy that will finally drive out tuberculosis. You might as well trifle with cholera. You have been spending hundreds of millions of dollars on less of a promise than that. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] or anyone else as to the importance of this appropriation. I agree that the eradication of tuberculosis is one of the most important problems that Congress has to deal with. But, gentlemen, the Department of Agriculture and the Committee on Agriculture have a number of important measures and problems to deal with. It has been the policy and the endeavor of the committee to deal with every problem that is called to its attention and to give to each problem due consideration. And, gentlemen, if you will compare the liberal appropriations made for this purpose with those made for other lines of work you will all agree, I believe, that the committee has been most liberal.

I have been interested in this work for more than a quarter of a century. Ten years ago we succeeded in making a small appropriation. This work has been conducted by the department. Last year \$132,000 was expended. The department this year estimates an increase of \$66,000, bringing the total up to \$198,000. The committee held special hearings, and the committee increased the appropriation to \$250,000, an increase of nearly 100 per cent over the appropriation made last year. When Dr. Kiernan was asked about the amount of money that might be expended to advantage we were told that \$250,000, not a dollar more, could be used.

He was asked this question several times. He appeared before the committee as the representative of the department. He represented Dr. Mohler. He spoke for Dr. Mohler, and Dr. Mohler says through Mr. Kiernan that \$250,000 is every dollar that can be spent to advantage in the department for this purpose.

Now, as I have said, we have other problems to deal with. We are trying to be practical. Gentlemen, are we going to take care of the small problems and overlook the larger problems? Take the appropriation made, for instance, for the study and control of the black rust. We are told that the loss resulting from tuberculosis amounts to \$25,000,000 per annum. Let us look into the wheat problem. Anybody who knows anything about the destruction by the black rust will, I am sure, admit that the yield of wheat can be increased 50 per cent by eradica-

tion of the black rust. The wheat estimate for this year is 668,000,000 bushels. The average for five years was 802,000,000 bushels. Increase that 50 per cent—no, increase it only 25 per cent—and you have an increase of 200,000,000 bushels, which at the present price, about \$2 a bushel, would make \$400,000,000. That, my friends, is sixteen times \$25,000,000. Are you as business men, are you as Representatives of these wheat-growing States going to say to the people, "We propose to give \$500,000 for the investigation of tuberculosis," when you can increase the production of wheat by 200,000,000 bushels, or \$400,000,000, by making more liberal appropriation for the eradication of black rust?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Does the gentleman think it is a good argument, because he was not able to get the amount of money available for wheat diseases increased, to refuse to permit the increase of this appropriation for tuberculosis?

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman is a member of the committee, and he knows that we did increase that appropriation.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. How much?

Mr. HAUGEN. Thirty thousand dollars. We expended \$20,000 last year for the investigation of the black rust, and at the suggestion of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young] and myself the appropriation was increased to \$50,000.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Was it increased by as much as you asked?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; every dollar, which is more than double the amount estimated for by the department.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Did not the gentleman from Iowa make practically the same speech before the committee that he is making now, complaining of the small amount of money appropriated for wheat diseases and of the large amount of money appropriated for the pink boll weevil? The department asked \$800,000 for the new disease.

Mr. HAUGEN. We got an increase of 150 per cent and cut the \$800,000 appropriation down to \$500,000. The appropriation for the study of the black rust last year was \$20,000, and we increased it 150 per cent, or up to \$50,000. Now, gentlemen, here we have an appropriation of \$50,000 for the investigation of black rust, which, if successful, may increase the production of wheat to the extent of at least 200,000,000 bushels, or \$400,000,000. As the gentleman will remember, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKINLEY] asked for an increase in the appropriation for the investigation of the production of corn. An increase of \$25,000 was granted, making an appropriation, all told, of \$65,000. So we have one appropriation of \$50,000 and another of \$65,000, or \$115,000, for the investigation and study of the black rust and diseases affecting the production of corn and wheat.

Mr. SLOAN. Did Mr. McKINLEY and yourself get all that was asked for for these two purposes?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; the gentleman from Illinois got all the increase he asked for—an increase of about 60 per cent. We have increased these two appropriations about 100 per cent and a decrease of nearly one-half of the \$800,000, so there is no discrimination in that respect.

Mr. LOBECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. I should like to yield, but my time is limited.

Mr. SLOAN. One other question—

Mr. LOBECK. I simply wish to ask if anybody is complaining because they got this extra? We were all in favor of it.

Mr. HAUGEN. I am pointing out the injustice of increasing this appropriation when we are appropriating only \$115,000 for the eradication of black rust and for the improvement and increase of our corn crop. I am pointing out the discrimination against wheat and corn, the injustice of asking for \$500,000 for the eradication of tuberculosis. We have in this country about 63,600,000 head of cattle, valued at \$2,824,221,000. Our wheat crop alone is estimated at 668,000,000 bushels, worth at present prices about \$1,250,000,000. Our corn crop is estimated at three and a quarter billion bushels; it is worth \$1.50 a bushel; if so, we have about \$4,500,000,000 for corn. The value of the wheat crop and the corn crop is more than double the value of all our live stock. Here we appropriate \$250,000 for the study and eradication of tuberculosis. This bill carries \$26,943,000. Much of that amount is available for the eradication of tuberculosis. We appropriate large amounts of money for the eradication of hog cholera. We have an appropriation for the foot-and-mouth disease, and various appropriations; and if you will go through the bill you will find that we have dollars available for the eradication of diseases in animals where there are cents available for the more important work of the eradication of diseases of wheat, corn, and other cereals. My friends, as I



started out to say, the committee tries to give due consideration to every problem, to every item, that is submitted to it. We want to do the practical thing. We want to deal with the larger things and not overlook the smaller ones. We all agree as to the importance of this item. As I have said, I have been interested in this work for 25 years. When I served in our State legislature I tried to secure legislation and appropriations for this purpose. I think I had as much to do as anybody with having this item put in the bill here 10 years ago. It has been in the bill all these years, and during all that time the department has given it consideration. As I said, \$132,000 was expended last year. Some 8,000 or 9,000 cattle are being tested every month.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I want to get at the real facts in the matter. The gentleman states that the department does not want this extra appropriation of \$250,000.

Mr. HAUGEN. The subcommittee had before them Dr. Kiernan and other representatives of the department. Dr. Kiernan was asked as to the amount of money that should be appropriated, and he said \$250,000. He was asked two or three times if it would not be possible for him to use more money; the answer was "No." The gentleman has spoken about veterinarians. He says if you pay the price you can get them. As the gentleman knows, thousands of veterinarians have joined the Army.

Not only from the Department of Agriculture, but they come from every community in this land. The question is this: Are you going to draw on the department for that service? The department says it requires skilled and trained veterinarians to conduct the work. Are you going to draw on the department force to do this work at the risk of neglecting other work, such as meat inspection, and take veterinarians from other communities who are now needed to do veterinary work there; are you going to say to the community, "Let us take the services of these men away from you and deprive you of their services, much needed?"

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Has any plan been submitted at all for the expenditure of this additional \$250,000?

Mr. HAUGEN. No definite plan. When the gentleman from Nebraska and others asked me what I thought of increasing the appropriation I answered, "If you are going to increase the appropriation, you ought to submit some definite plan of operation." I said, "If large appropriations of money are to be made, the dumping of it by the millions will do no good unless you have a definite plan to work by."

Mr. Chairman, just one word as to the suggestion of reimbursing the owner of the stock. According to the estimates furnished by the department, the value of our live stock is \$2,824,000,000. The statement has been made on this floor that 10 per cent of the cattle are infected with tuberculosis.

If so, it would require about \$282,000,000 to pay the losses resulting from tuberculosis. As usual, many tears have been shed for the poor farmer. Oh, it is always the dear farmer that we are legislating for. Now, anyone who knows anything about this proposition knows that the loss is borne by the packers. The packers have been doing fairly well. I find, according to reports, that Swift & Co. increased its profits from \$9,000,000 in 1915 to \$20,465,000 in 1916. Armour & Co. increased its profits from \$6,000,000 in 1915 to \$20,100,000 in 1916. So, my friends, they are doing fairly well. I believe we can appropriate money to better advantage than to appropriate an additional \$250,000 to reimburse the packers at this time. Suggestions have been made that we should increase meat production. No one will seriously contend that an additional appropriation of \$250,000, or even \$1,000,000, can increase the production of meat within a short time. That can not be done in one session of Congress.

As before stated, we are expected to furnish 800,000,000 bushels of grain for our allies and soldiers abroad. We had a short crop; the supply is not in sight; food is as important as powder and guns, and it is our solemn duty to supply those who have taken their lives in their hands, who are willing to lay them upon their country's altar as a sacrifice in the defense of their country. Our word and our resources have been pledged; our honor is at stake as well as our country; we are all of one mind, and that is to do everything in our power to successfully prosecute this war and to bring about a speedy and triumphant termination of this terrible conflict in which the world is engaged. With that in view, it is up to us to do the practical things, for us to appropriate money for the purposes that will bring the best results.

In view of the meager appropriation of \$115,000 for the eradication of black rust and stripe rust, for the study of corn improvement, methods of corn production, and of corn-root and

stalk diseases, affecting the yield of our wheat, corn, and other cereals, aggregating upward of 6,000,000,000 bushels, which in point of value is more than twice the value of all our live stock, including hogs, can we as practical men representing our constituency do what is proposed to do, increase the proposed appropriation of \$250,000, which is an increase of \$50,000 in excess of the department's estimates and nearly 100 per cent in excess of the amount appropriated and expended in the current fiscal year, to \$500,000? Besides the \$250,000, this bill carries more than \$500,000 for inspection and quarantine work and the study of existence of contagious diseases of animals; \$620,420 for the eradication of the southern cattle tick; \$364,390 for the investigation and experiment in dairy industry; \$308,680 for investigation and experiments in animal husbandry; \$124,560 for scientific investigation in diseases of animals at Bethesda, Md.; \$446,900 for investigation in the disease of hog cholera; in all, a total appropriation of \$2,743,098 for the bureau. In addition to that the permanent annual appropriation of \$3,000,000 and \$477,200 carried in this bill for meat inspection. Gentlemen, it seems to me that if our aim is to increase production by making liberal appropriations, we should, rather than to double the proposed appropriation, increase the appropriations proposed for the larger and, I believe, the more important products of the farm.

Another question is whether we are going to take the advice of men who have made an exhaustive study of the matter, men of ability, backed by enthusiasm, who say that not more than \$250,000 can be effectively used. I take it that it can be said without reflecting upon anyone that the department that has this work in charge has more thorough knowledge of the amount of money and activity that can be devoted to this line of work than Members of Congress. True, in local matters, Members have more knowledge, but when it comes to the dealing with all problems of this great department, affecting every section of our country and the policy of the department, I believe its conclusions and recommendations are worthy of the highest consideration. We should at least give the representatives of these bureaus of the department credit of knowing what they are talking about. And if we do, then it is up to us to act in accordance with their recommendation. That has been the policy of the committee. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that we have only two additional speeches on this side, and I will ask the gentleman from Michigan to use some of his time.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WASON].

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I am a little surprised at the attitude of some Members of this House in approaching the discussion of this proposed amendment to the bill. As we all know and realize, our country is at war. Our Government is urging everybody to do his part. Our Government is urging everybody to conserve our national resources. Our Government is urging everybody to produce from the soil and in the industries the most that can be produced, in order that we may bring about an early, just, and lasting peace for the warring nations of the world. And yet here, when we are dealing with the subject of agriculture, which is the basis, the foundation, the strength, and sinew behind our Army and Navy, we find men differing on the importance of conserving our live stock, which furnishes meat for our people at home, our soldiers at the front, as well as our allies.

I said that agriculture was the basis and strength of our people in this war. From the soil comes the wheat, the corn, the barley, the rye. From the soil comes the mineral and the ore that we need. From the soil comes the cotton and the cane. From the soil comes the oil and other products. The soil furnishes the food to raise our cattle and our swine and our horses. From the soil comes the lumber that furnishes the material for our homes, the cantonments, and the structures for our industries.

We must assist and conserve and encourage these great agencies which are effective in the prosecution of this war. The Department of Agriculture estimates that \$25,000,000 is wasted every year in live stock with that dread disease that was first discovered in 1882 by Prof. Koch, a German scientist. Twenty-five million dollars annually lost in live-stock production from this disease, and yet men quibble here over raising the appropriation to half a million dollars that we may reduce the disease and have more meat, more pork, more fats for our people, our allies, and our soldiers, more hides for shoes, and so on through the list of necessities.

We appropriate money right and left for anything we believe will help us to successfully prosecute and win this war.



I say to you that I believe we can appropriate half a million dollars, and the Department of Agriculture can collect the force of men necessary in a very short time who will start out on an active and effective campaign that will soon result in great reduction of the \$25,000,000 loss among the great herds of this country.

My colleague [Mr. Young of North Dakota] asks if we need veterinarians for this work. I presume that officials of the Department of Agriculture would say that we did, but you and I know that we do not. All that is needed is the instrument and proper tuberculin, and the eyesight of the average farmer is good enough to do the rest and make successful tests.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WASON. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. If that is so, what is the use of appropriating money? If the farmer can do it himself, why should we appropriate this large sum? The department says it requires skilled and trained veterinarians.

Mr. WASON. In answer to my distinguished friend I will say that if there is anything the department does except to make scientific researches, that the average farmer can not do if equipped with proper instruments and appliances, I would like my friend from Iowa to state it.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will answer by saying that \$8,000 was appropriated last year for research work.

Mr. WASON. After hearing Dr. Mohler's statement of the Department of Agriculture relating to the wide area in which tuberculosis is found in live stock it seems reasonable to believe that Congress would be willing to adopt this amendment and appropriate \$500,000 for a campaign of eradication.

Again, by comparison, as provided in the terms of this very bill, it would seem fair and just that \$500,000 should be appropriated for this particular menace to our live stock. We appropriate \$620,420 for expenses for the eradication of the southern cattle ticks, \$500,000 to conduct surveys and inspections in Texas or any other State and Mexico to stamp out and exterminate the pink bollworm of cotton, and \$650,140 for farmers' cooperative demonstrations for study and demonstration of the best methods for meeting the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil. Thus it will be noticed we appropriate \$1,150,140 for the control and eradication of the boll weevil and the pink bollworm, which are a menace to the cotton crop. Is it not fair that a half million, or a sum equal to that appropriated for the eradication of the cattle tick, be appropriated for the control and eradication of tuberculosis?

Again, this bill carries an appropriation of \$250,000 for investigation, eradication, and control of the disease of citrus trees known as citrus canker.

Are either of these menaces carrying the same amount of money or more of greater menace to production than is tuberculosis?

J. R. Mohler, Acting Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, makes the following pertinent suggestions of the department's policy relating to tuberculosis eradication:

The department's policy in tuberculosis eradication is a cooperative one. For every Federal employee furnished the State is expected to provide at least one veterinarian. The campaign against tuberculosis will be divided into three projects, as follows:

1. Tuberculosis Eradication among Pure-Bred Herds.
2. Tuberculosis Eradication among Swine.
3. Tuberculosis Eradication in Circumscribed Areas.

Pure-bred herds which have been tuberculin tested and found to be free from tuberculosis will be classed as accredited herds; that is, herds which the State or Federal authorities may certify to as being free from the disease. This certification will be a tremendous stimulation to the trade among cattle known to be healthy. The prospective purchaser will be willing to part with his money when he invests in cows which are not blighted by disease. The person who is upbuilding his herd will find security when he purchases registered sires and dams to introduce into his bovine family. The known healthy animal will be in great demand, whereas the unknown quantity will be on the bargain counter. The accredited herds will have entrée into any society, while the unknown will be eligible only for use in localities where there is a premium on inefficient live stock.

The movement to establish accredited herds is purely a voluntary one. No laws or regulations will be necessary to assure the success of this plan. Its success will depend upon the judgment and decision of the live-stock owners. It is a practical proposition for the practical live-stock owner. It is a plan of fair dealing without the speculative chance which attends the purchasing of cattle which are members of a herd known to contain, or to have recently contained, animals which are affected with tuberculosis, or which at least are under suspicion.

Tuberculosis of swine exists to an alarming degree. Each year the carcasses of thousands of swine are condemned as unfit for human consumption at abattoirs where Federal inspection is maintained.

The remedy for this evil is the pasteurization of dairy by-products which are fed to swine and, of course, the elimination of the existing cause—the tuberculous animals which are the distributors of the tubercle bacilli.

The extermination of the disease from circumscribed areas is the greatest task to be undertaken. An area that has been freed of tuberculosis must be kept clean by quarantine regulations which will prevent the introduction into it of animals affected with the disease. Such areas should be established in every State. It may be an area representing 500 square miles or any multiple of that up to the entire area of the

State. In such an area all herds should be subjected to the tuberculin test. The reactors should be immediately separated from the healthy animals and disposed of in accordance with State regulations. If the reactors are to remain alive, they should be kept segregated and under strict surveillance. They should be so marked that their condition can not ever be misrepresented. Their progeny should be taken away from them immediately after calving and placed with healthy foster mothers, or fed on pasteurized milk. Retesting shall be practiced semiannually to begin with, and then for a number of years to assure of the entire eradication of the disease. Except from accredited herds, no cattle shall be introduced into any free or circumscribed area in which tuberculosis eradication is being conducted for dairy or breeding purposes unless they are held in quarantine for a period of 60 days, at the expiration of which time they will be tuberculin tested.

From this statement you will notice that the department intends to free our livestock from this menace by disposing by slaughter or segregation infected animals. It seems the department would do well to conduct scientific researches for some method of preventing animals from becoming infected with tuberculosis. Prof. Koch in his researches discovered the germ, classified it as bacillus tuberculosis, which affects persons as well as live stock. He later produced in his laboratory the substance known as tuberculin.

The substance known as tuberculin is an attenuated solution of some substance or medium in which tubercle bacilli have been grown or propagated and from which the bacilli themselves have been carefully removed. Beef bouillon, for instance, is a substance in which the germs can be multiplied rapidly at the proper temperature, and when the actual germs have been carefully separated from it after having been produced to a certain point and a percentage of glycerine has been added for the purpose of dilution the result is the tuberculin of commerce, which is used by veterinarians for the testing of cattle.

The value of tuberculin in determining the extent of tuberculosis in living cattle is an accepted fact. While it is not an infallible test of the presence of the disease, its use has been confirmed in a very large percentage of the cases where the animals have been condemned and destroyed and it has been of invaluable assistance in carrying out the Bang method of treating tuberculosis as practiced in Denmark and the Ostertag method, which is in use in various parts of Europe.

Some 17 years ago a discovery was made by Dr. E. von Behring, of Marburg—

which promises to be as important and far-reaching in its preventive efficacy toward bovine tuberculosis as was Jenner's smallpox vaccine toward the dreaded scourge of smallpox. Dr. von Behring produced a substance in his laboratory at Marburg called "Bovovaccine," which appears to possess the property of immunizing cattle treated with it while they are quite young against tubercular infection during their entire lives. A sufficient time has now elapsed, so that results of carefully conducted experiments in its use have become of great value in determining the fact that all cattle may be immunized against danger of infection from any source, and they hold out the hope that the time may not be far distant when the "cattle on a thousand hills" may every one be free from disease and no longer a menace to human life.

Bovovaccine consists of a mitigated culture of live human tubercle bacilli, which is injected directly into the circulatory system of young calves, and which seems to possess the power of rendering them immune to tubercular infection during their life. Of course, this last proposition has not yet been absolutely proven, since a sufficient number of years has not elapsed to cover the average meat animal.

Experiments abroad and in this country have been very extensively carried on for years with the most gratifying results; and in some of the cattle-raising districts of central Europe bovine vaccination has become a regular part of the system of live-stock raising. The immunizing system of Dr. von Behring has been extensively practiced on the estates of his royal highness, Prince Louis of Bavaria, at Savar, Hungary, where the most careful records have been kept. The results are astonishing. In many cases the most persistent efforts to infect animals which had been bovine vaccinated, both by contact with diseased animals in stables which were known to be infected and by the injection of virus from diseased animals directly into the system, have failed.

This process of vaccination by the use of bovine vaccine has been tried in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Ohio, and Maryland. Those farmers who have used it most extensively feel that it does not injure the animal, and that the animal is immune from tuberculosis thereafter. I want to call your attention to a testimonial of the State of Maine Cattle Commission in 1910:

During the past four years our experience with bovine vaccine has been considerable, and I wish to assure you that the results have been exceedingly satisfactory. The work of immunization has been carried on in some of our worst infected herds, and I feel that it has been given a severe test. The results have been such that it seemed a valuable adjunct in our work of eradicating tuberculosis; consequently at the last session of the legislature a law was passed providing bovine vaccine free of charge to the breeders of this State. Many breeders are availing themselves of this opportunity to build up immune herds, and I trust the number will increase.

J. M. DEERING.

If animals can be made immune from tuberculosis by this use of bovine vaccine, it seems to me that is the quickest and surest and the most complete method of control and eradication of tuberculosis in the herds of this country. I sincerely hope the Department of Agriculture will conduct such research work along these lines as will demonstrate fully and completely the worth of this proposed prevention or the fallacy of Prof. von Behring's discovery.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD].



Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, my attention was especially called to this question a few years ago, when a whole herd was condemned and killed in my own district when it was found that it was tubercular. All of us agree here to-day that this work of stamping out the disease is needed, badly needed. The only problem seems to be with the department. We have a department, a bureau, that can use only a definite amount, we are told, in the solution of a problem of this character, and we are further told that if we appropriate \$500,000 their plans are not elastic enough to take care of that amount of money. I understand, too, that the head of the bureau, who knows more about it than perhaps any other member of the department, said unqualifiedly that he could use \$1,000,000 and use it effectively. When the matter was before the committee one of the assistants of the bureau spoke before the committee, so I am informed. Later, I am informed, the head of the bureau still insists that he can use that effectively.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. In order that it may be clearly understood, Dr. Mohler was out of the city, but he sent Dr. Kiernan there to represent him. He came there as Dr. Mohler's representative, and he positively stated and restated two or three times that \$250,000 was every dollar that they could use.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. But is it not true that when Dr. Mohler had himself returned to the city and he was asked if he had changed his mind, he said no, that he stood by what he said originally and that he could use \$1,000,000.

Mr. HAUGEN. He did not state that to the committee.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. It would be very strange if the plans for the expenditure of \$250,000 could not be enlarged with a proper personnel to spend \$500,000. We all know that on problems of this kind it is largely a question of propaganda. We all know that the farmer will resent a local man coming into his herd and condemning it. We all know that throughout the length and breadth of this country much of the \$250,000 could be easily expended in a propaganda in making people understand.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. How much would the gentleman spend in propaganda on this question?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I could not say offhand how much, but if the gentleman would tell me how much was spent in propaganda for the study of food conservation, how much we have spent in propaganda for the sale of liberty bonds, and how much in propaganda for everything else, I would say that the same relative percentage might be expended wisely in the propaganda on this question.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Does the gentleman care to know the exact words of Dr. Kiernan, the representative of the Department of Agriculture, when he testified that the maximum amount he could use was \$250,000?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I think I have quoted them correctly; but let me repeat, he was there while the head of the department was out of the city, and when the head of the department was questioned in regard to the matter he still insisted that he could expend \$500,000. I may be wrongly informed.

Mr. RUBEY. The gentleman is entirely misinformed on that proposition, as I expect to show in a few minutes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Then the matter is a question of veracity as between the members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER].

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, this item is a new item for the purpose of attempting in a small way, at any rate, to do away with tuberculosis among our domestic animals. There are two diseases which are most prevalent and fatal to our domestic animals, hog cholera and tuberculosis. Hog cholera is fatal only to swine, but tuberculosis attacks every one of our domestic animals, including chickens, sheep, hogs, cattle, and is also the most fatal of all diseases to the human race. Therefore, anything that we can do to alleviate some of the terrible ravages of this disease I think is a good thing for the American Congress to spend money for. I find in the public press of yesterday a statement by Mr. Hoover that we are required to furnish 70,000,000 pounds a month of beef to Europe. This is an increase of 7,000 per cent over what we furnished them before the war. The average then was about 1,000,000 pounds a month. We are to furnish 150,000,000 pounds per month of pork, which is an increase of 300 per cent above what we furnished before the war. We might as well face the fact that we are not going to increase our production of hogs and cattle during this war. We can only strive to save the herds

we have and prevent waste by useless losses. There are more losses of live stock in cattle and hogs from these two diseases I have mentioned than all other diseases combined. Tuberculosis is a disease which is very easily located by the use of the tuberculin test. There is only one way to eradicate it, and that is by quarantine and slaughter of the animals that are infected. We attacked the foot-and-mouth disease in this country a short time ago, which is not nearly so dangerous or widespread as tuberculosis. There is not a single State in the country whose domestic animals are not infected with tuberculosis. I think the chairman informed the House that something like \$2,500,000 were appropriated by the last Congress to stamp out the foot-and-mouth disease. The work was successfully done, and, as I understand it, we have not a single case of foot-and-mouth disease in America to-day. In my judgment, if Congress would appropriate the proper amount, tuberculosis among our cattle herds could be eradicated in a very short time by slaughter and quarantine and proper sanitation.

Tuberculosis is not an inherited disease, as some think, but is a disease which must come from a preexisting cause or contagion; so, necessarily, if we eradicate tuberculosis from our cattle and properly disinfect the buildings and grounds we can eradicate this disease entirely, unless—

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Now, I grant what the gentleman says is so, but our committee tried to find some way whereby the department might expend more money even than we gave them. Now, can the gentleman tell how he would spend this additional sum over and above the amount stated which the Agricultural Department says they can expend in all good faith.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Now, I do not think that the Agricultural Department, perhaps, has given a correct statement of the amount of money that might be expended in the attempt to eradicate tuberculosis. I do not know where they expect to use it—

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I know the gentleman is an expert on tuberculosis, but are not there experts in the department equally as efficient on this subject?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Sometimes I have been forced to this conclusion: That an agricultural expert is a man who finds out something that has been known by other people for a long time and then talks about it in language that nobody can understand, and is then designated as an expert. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Of course, the gentleman would not include Dr. Mohler and Mr. Kiernan in that class of experts?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I am sure Dr. Mohler would agree that if this Congress would appropriate a sufficient sum to do the thing I have stated—that is, test these cattle and slaughter those found infected and reimburse the owners, as you did in your eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease, by fair amount, whatever the amount would be—you would stamp out tuberculosis. Moreover, I think the sum of money asked or even the \$250,000 is entirely insufficient and that the \$500,000 asked for is also insufficient, but it would be very much better than the amount which you are granting.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will.

Mr. HAUGEN. Does the gentleman suggest a reimbursement to the owners?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. That would take about \$28,000,000.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I think while we are spending billions and multiplied billions for other purposes we might spend \$28,000,000 in this way, if that is what it will cost.

Mr. HAUGEN. And this calls for half a million.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. They did not ask for enough, that is all.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] has told us that his State by law provides that grade cattle slaughtered because they reacted as tubercular shall be compensated for at a fair figure and pure breeds at a higher price. If the Nation would take example from Missouri and make similar provision this great scourge to animal life, and mankind alike, could be soon stamped out. The fact that tuberculosis is not inherited, but must be contracted after birth from contagion from an already existing case has been established beyond doubt. Once eradicated from our country it can be kept out forever. The dairy cattle of England, France, and Germany are full of it, but there has never been a case of it on the Channel Islands of Jersey, because importation of cattle is prohibited there. We permit this scourge to carry certain death to animals and men because we will not appropriate the money necessary to stamp out the plague. We spend a billion without batting an eye for instru-



ments of death with which to kill men, but gentlemen lift their voices in protest at the proposition of spending a few millions for the certain benefit of humanity.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the attitude of the members of the committee with reference to this matter. The head of the department thinks that \$250,000 is all that can be used. There is a difference of opinion among members of the department, but the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry says that \$1,000,000 can be advantageously expended for the extirpation of tuberculosis in animals. Now, gentlemen, I want to call the attention of this committee to the fact that nearly every increase that has been made in this appropriation bill throughout the years that have passed has been made because of an increase over estimates made by the department. The chairman of the committee well knows, from his experience both before and since he has been chairman, that more of the increases made have been made by the House over the estimates made by the department itself. The department acts conservatively. It understands that \$250,000,000 is an immense sum. It feels that it ought not to increase it any more than it can within the realm of reason, and it also feels the necessity of coordinating these appropriations and making them reasonable. As my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, said, the increase asked for is large, compared with some other appropriations contained in the bill. It is also small as compared with some others. I want to say to my colleague from Iowa what he knows very much better than I do, that there never has been an agricultural appropriation bill passed that has not had the same objection existing in it, and that is the case because the agricultural resources of the United States of America are so tremendous in extent, they are so diversified in character, that a proper relation is impossible to be maintained. Conditions arise from time to time that could not have been anticipated. We are required very largely to pass on each individual proposition as if it stood alone. So that comparisons, I think, ought not to weigh very much with the members of the committee in voting for this appropriation.

Now, gentlemen, we are confronted with this situation. We are confronted, as the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALEENBERGER] says, with the most extraordinary demand that has ever been made upon this country, a demand which we must answer, whether we wish or not. It must be taken from our sources of supplies. We must furnish our allies across the seas with 70,000,000 pounds of meat each month during the succeeding months of the year. That will diminish our supply, necessarily. If we do not take extraordinary measures, if we do not use extraordinary means for increasing the meat production in the United States, we will not be doing our duty in this emergency. Seventeen years after the census of 1900 was taken we have 4,000,000 head of cattle less than we had at that time. The reduction, notwithstanding the tremendous increase in our population, was from about 67,000,000 in 1900 to 63,000,000 now—is that correct?

Mr. HAUGEN. Sixty-three million six hundred thousand.

Mr. TOWNER. I think it was about 67,000,000 in 1900, and it is now reduced to 63,000,000 in round numbers. That is the reduction in the number of cattle in the United States—more than 4,000,000—notwithstanding the tremendous increase in population, notwithstanding the tremendous, the extraordinary demand that is now made upon us. If we know that this legislation will increase the meat supply in the United States, can we, if we would do our full duty, neglect to do everything that is possible in order to increase the meat supply? Now, I call attention—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. May I have just one minute more; I want to say just one more sentence.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield the gentleman one minute.

Mr. TOWNER. I want to call the attention of Members here to the fact that not a cattle association in the United States, not a dairy association in the United States, but what has favored or does favor this legislation. All the information that comes from the people immediately interested says, "Give all the help that you can in order that we may stamp out this disease."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY].

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Is this the closing speech?

Mr. LEVER. I have two on this side. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY].

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this is a friendly contest. The members of the Committee on

Agriculture, all of them, are anxious to do what they think is right and what they think is for the best interests of the country. They have shown that disposition from the very beginning in the consideration of this bill, both in the committee and on the floor. And so to-day we are here in a friendly spirit making this contest.

I come from a State that is the fifth State in the Union in the production last year of agricultural products. I come from a State that has a great many dairy cattle and other kinds of cattle. I am sure that I am just as anxious as are the gentlemen who have spoken on that side to do everything that we possibly can do to stamp out tuberculosis. But I am not willing to go further or do more than those in charge of the Department of Agriculture say they can do.

Now, I want to talk to you for a moment, and I want to talk to you plainly. The other day, when we were discussing this matter on the floor of the House, some gentlemen stated that Dr. Mohler, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, had said that he could use \$1,000,000. I knew that before the committee Mr. Kiernan had said that they could not use more than \$250,000. I also knew that the Secretary of Agriculture had said that they could not use more than \$250,000. And so I called up Dr. Mohler and I told him of the statements that were being made on the floor of the House in the general debate, to the effect that he had said that he could use \$1,000,000. In reply this is, in substance, the statement that Dr. Mohler made to me:

Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars is all we can use economically and effectively unless the Congress of the United States gives us authority to reimburse the owners for the slaughtering of their cattle. If they give us authority to reimburse for the slaughtering of cattle, we can use \$1,000,000; we can use all the money that the Congress may give to us.

Now, this is the situation: Not a single dollar of this appropriation of \$250,000 that is carried in this bill can be used to reimburse owners for the slaughtering of their cattle, not a cent of it, and it can not be done unless this Congress legislates and gives specific authority to do that sort of thing.

Mr. LITTLE. Is the gentleman opposed to the policy of reimbursement?

Mr. RUBEY. Let me discuss that question just for a moment. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] a moment ago made a statement on the floor of this House. He said there were 22,000,000 dairy cattle in this country afflicted with tuberculosis.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Twenty-two million dairy cattle in this country, of which 2,000,000 were afflicted with tuberculosis.

Mr. RUBEY. I misunderstood the gentleman. But I want to say this, that if you will figure up the number of cattle in this country and their value and the number afflicted with tuberculosis and their value, and then estimate how much money it will take for the Government to reimburse the owners for cattle slaughtered, you will find that it will take a very large sum of money. This will be true even if the Government reimbursed to the amount of one-fourth the value and leave the States to reimburse to the amount of one-fourth, leaving the owners to bear one-half the burden. When we come to that question, we ought to stop and study for a moment and find out, if we can, where we are going to get the money.

Mr. LITTLE. Are not the States already reimbursing?

Mr. RUBEY. They are to some extent.

Mr. LITTLE. Do you not believe we ought to help them?

Mr. RUBEY. When Congress determines to reimburse we will do as much as they do. The gentleman will find, if he will examine into it, that they are not reimbursing in every State of the Union, not by any means. A great many of them do not reimburse a single cent.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEY. I will.

Mr. TOWNER. I am informed, and I would like to know if the gentleman confirms the statement, that there are 15 States in the Union that make absolute reimbursement for the slaughter of cattle, and that 5 other States make compulsory extermination of those affected—

Mr. RUBEY. I have before me a full and complete statement showing exactly what every State of the Union does in the way of reimbursement. And yet the statement is misleading, because, for instance, they say that in Missouri they reimburse to the amount of \$40 for the common stock and \$200 for the thoroughbreds. And yet it depends upon the amount of money that the legislature appropriates. And the legislature does not appropriate enough money to do that, except in a very limited way, and what is true in my State is also true in pretty nearly every other State. If every State of the Union would appropriate enough money to pay one-fourth of the value of the



cattle slaughtered they would appropriate many millions of dollars. But they do not do it.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEY. I yield.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The gentleman is aware that a great majority of these cattle that are slaughtered are not a loss at all; that the cattle are slaughtered and the disease is eradicated, but the carcass itself is valuable for beef. So that the amount of actual loss to be recompensed would be infinitesimal.

Mr. RUBEY. I recognize that what the gentleman says is true in part. The whole animal is not always destroyed.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I have had a number of animals slaughtered, but I never had one that did not sell for beef; did not have one where there was a loss of the carcass.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RUBEY. Not until I get through.

Mr. LINTHICUM. You made certain statements as to what I said, and then do not yield?

Mr. RUBEY. I yield to the gentleman. I do not want to incorrectly quote him.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Did you read where it said that the segregation of these animals would effect great results and it was not necessary to slaughter them?

Mr. RUBEY. I read that, and I do not desire to misquote him. The point I want to make is this; that we have this appropriation here of \$250,000, not a cent of which can be used to reimburse the owners for the slaughter of their cattle. Unless you are going to give the authority to reimburse, then Dr. Mohler, the chief of the bureau, himself says that this is all the money he can use. If you are going to give more money, you should also give him additional authority, in order that he may pay for the reimbursement for the cattle which are slaughtered. You can not put that provision in this bill. Any man on the floor of the House could stop it by a point of order, because it is new legislation. The committee, in the framing of this bill, tried to bring in a bill that was clean, a bill that did not call for additional legislation, and in very few instances have we inserted provisions against which a point of order will hold.

Now, the committee studied this subject very carefully. A subcommittee was appointed; we had a subcommittee of five, and we called before us Dr. Kiernan, of the Department of Agriculture. We had his statement. We framed this legislation. I wrote the language myself. The subcommittee and the whole committee agreed that we ought to take this proposition out, segregate it, and put it into an item by itself, so that the House itself would know just what we were doing and know along what lines we were legislating, and in order that the whole country might know it. Not only that, but if my recollection serves me correctly—and I think it does—the only question upon which the subcommittee was divided was the question of reimbursement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. RUBEY. I would like to have five minutes more.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. RUBEY. The only question, I say, upon which the subcommittee was divided was the question of reimbursement. Some members of the committee wanted to reimburse, but the entire subcommittee reported in favor of the \$250,000 for carrying on this work.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that we ought to go beyond that which the department has asked for. The department has been working along this line since last July. The first appropriation for the work of eradicating tuberculosis went into the last appropriation bill, and the department took up the work last July.

They have just organized the work; they have not been able to do much, have not had it organized more than two or three months. The Bureau of Animal Industry will have charge of this work. Those in charge have prepared comprehensive plans embracing the entire country. They have explained to the committee in reports and in the hearings just exactly how they are going to use this money. This appropriation will be available on the 1st of next July. Let those in charge of the bureau go right on carrying out the plans they have matured with the money they now have, and when July comes let them increase the work, and if they find that they can get more competent and capable men to do the work, and if they find that they need more money and can use it economically and efficiently, when this Congress meets again next December we can give them more

money. They can report to the committee the conditions as they then exist and we can bring in an additional appropriation, make it immediately available, and give them whatever they may need.

I would rather do that than to go ahead and give the Department of Agriculture twice as much money as it is asking for.

Gentlemen talk here about preserving health. We want to preserve the health of the people. Of course we do. We regret that children are dying from tuberculosis, which is sometimes contracted through the drinking of milk. Everybody regrets that sort of thing. The appropriation of an additional \$250,000 will not lessen that evil very much. If we want to do something to improve good health among the children of this country we could appropriate a million dollars to increase the supply of pure water, because the drinking of impure water causes more sickness than any other one thing in this great country of ours. If you are seeking only to conserve the health of the country, there are many things we might do.

It is said that \$25,000,000 is lost every year on account of the cattle that are slaughtered because of tuberculosis. That is true, and we all regret it. If you want to more greatly conserve the food supply of the country, I could suggest another line of work. I saw only yesterday in the papers a statement that a billion dollars' worth of property, principally foodstuff, was destroyed every year by rats. We might get busy along that line, appropriate a million dollars, and kill the rats, if we want to conserve the food products of the country.

I want to say to you gentlemen now that you should study this matter carefully. I am for the eradication of tuberculosis. I want to see it done just as rapidly as possible. Our committee has given to it its careful and candid consideration, and we are here to-day to give the department what it wants and nothing more. We are giving them \$50,000 more than they asked for when they submitted their estimates. We have given them \$250,000, and this House ought to give them what they ask, and it ought not to give them a cent more than they ask, or a cent more than they can use economically and without wasting it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. RUBEY. I want to make just one more statement, and call it to your attention and consideration.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. In behalf of the committee I desire to yield one minute more to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. RUBEY. The question was asked on the floor a moment ago, "Is there any other way of getting rid of this disease except by destroying the cattle?" I read the other day a statement by a veterinarian of my State, Dr. D. F. Luckey, who has been State veterinarian for many years, and a very eminent one—a statement to the effect that he had discovered a serum which if applied to the calf would make it immune against tuberculosis. If the serum discovered by Dr. Luckey is as effective in preventing tuberculosis as the hog-cholera serum is in preventing hog cholera, then, indeed, will Dr. Luckey be hailed as a benefactor. The hog-cholera serum was discovered by a Missourian. May it not be possible that another eminent Missourian has made a discovery equally as valuable to the live-stock industry? We are making this appropriation in order that the department may investigate all lines. It may be that by the time we meet here again the department may have discovered something along this line whereby we may be able to get rid of tuberculosis without destroying the cattle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Iowa, and then the chairman of the committee [Mr. LEVER] will close the debate on this side.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Which side has the closing of this debate?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the usual practice of the House the chairman of the committee generally has the close. I do not think there is any special rule about it, but that is the practice of the House. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr.



McLAUGHLIN] has eight minutes remaining and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to answer pointedly the statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], who has just taken his seat. He suggests that the packers might profit by this amendment. If tuberculosis were a matter that stood between the people and the packers and the packers were to obtain one penny of advantage, there probably would be nobody here advocating it. It is in the hearings, not contradicted by any witness, that every penny lost at the packing plants by reason of tuberculosis found in any animal is charged to overhead expenses. That means that the consumer who buys the meat and the producer who sells jointly have to stand it. Everybody who understands the packing proposition knows that to be the fact. I do not see why the gentleman should have attempted to becloud or unwarrantably prejudice so important a proposition in that way.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. For a brief question.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman is familiar with the testimony. He was present at the time, and he knows that of the cattle and hogs slaughtered in some packing houses 20 per cent are infected with tuberculosis, and in others only a small percentage. And with the price uniform among the packers, how can that loss be adjusted?

Mr. SLOAN. It was testified that that was charged as an overhead expense, and that statement was not contradicted by any witness, and it is well understood generally. I think the packers have little difficulty in passing it on to the day's purchasers and the morrow's sellers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is some question raised about what Dr. Mohler has said. After all, there is not much difference. On July 17 Dr. Mohler recommended what the United States ought to do. Whether the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] be more accurate than the statement of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] or not, to say nothing about what I have stated on the floor, matters not. Here is what Dr. Mohler said in writing on July 17, 1918. If this committee did not respond to that and wants to put itself in a position of hurling tons of money into a new proposition, such as the pink bollworm, and to neglect this, let the responsibility rest where it should. This is what Dr. Mohler said (see the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture, held on Jan. 14, 1918):

Tuberculosis can not be wished away; neither can it be talked out of existence. The State must pay to exterminate it, since it has tolerated its existence these many years. The United States Congress and the legislatures of the various States will appropriate funds for the maintenance of fighting forces to cope with the situation. The live-stock owners have duties no less important than the aforementioned forces. Teamwork among all the forces will produce results which will be worth striving for and which will mean another glory for live-stock sanitation.

Moreover, Dr. Mohler said in the same statement as follows:

#### THE ERADICATION OF TUBERCULOSIS FROM LIVE STOCK.

Tuberculosis can be eradicated from all the cattle and all the swine in this Union; otherwise the Department of Agriculture would not have embarked upon such a tempestuous campaign.

To support such a broad assertion, there is an abundance of evidence obtained through the school of experience, covering a period of several years.

Tuberculosis has been eradicated from hundreds of herds in the District of Columbia, Virginia, Maryland, and other States. It has been practically exterminated from comparatively large circumscribed areas. Furthermore, wherever and whenever an effort was made to eradicate the plague and the earnest cooperation of the live-stock owners and officials has been obtained, success has never failed to crown the enterprise.

Herds of cattle, which have at the inception of the campaign contained 75 per cent of diseased animals, have been freed of the malady and have remained as free herds.

Herds which on the first test were found free of disease have, by the prudent care of their owners, been kept free of tuberculosis.

The experience the department has had, as outlined here, has been enjoyed by the veterinary officials of some States. The preponderance of successful experiments, if we may call them such, is convincing proof that when conditions are favorable tuberculosis may be eradicated.

What constitutes favorable conditions? The same state of mind of the people that obtained in the early nineties when pleuropneumonia was eradicated; in 1902, 1908, 1914, and 1915 when outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease were eradicated; the spirit that pervaded the Western States during the cattle and sheep scabies eradication campaign; the spirit that is aiding in the eradication of hog cholera; the same state of mind, the same earnest, hearty, wholesome and substantial cooperation that has made Texas fever eradication the marvel of live stock sanitary achievements.

The American people can eradicate tuberculosis, or prevent its eradication, or increase its presence.

In 1907 the bureau first undertook systematic investigations in regard to the eradication of bovine tuberculosis and the results which have been obtained through 10 years of study indicate that the eradication of tuberculosis of cattle and swine is probably the largest and most difficult problem which the bureau has undertaken to solve for the benefit of the live-stock industry and the general public, which benefits from the advancement of that industry.

It has been clearly demonstrated that tuberculosis can be eradicated from herds which are heavily infected with the disease and that tuberculosis herds can be freed from tuberculosis and maintained in a healthy condition through a period of years. In the demonstration work which has been conducted in the State of Virginia the past fiscal year showed 127 herds of cattle to be without the infection of tuberculosis at the time bureau cooperation was established. In the same State 138 infected herds have been made free from tuberculosis, and in accordance with the knowledge of the bureau this was accomplished in 126 cases without reinfections occurring. A large proportion of the herds were made free as the result of a single carefully applied tuberculosis test followed by the removal of reactors and the disinfection of the buildings. A second retest showed the eradication to have been completed in about 25 per cent of the herds.

The eradication of tuberculosis from cattle within a restricted area is a reasonable proposition as demonstrated in the District of Columbia where, in 1909, a compulsory tuberculin test became effective, and it was found that 18.87 per cent of the District cattle were tuberculous. This percentage was reduced as shown by the first retest to 3.2 per cent, and during the fiscal year terminating June 30, 1917, only 0.84 per cent of the District cattle reacted to the tuberculin test.

It may also be of interest to note that reactions to tuberculin tests applied by inspectors of this bureau are confirmed by post-mortem examinations, exhibiting lesions of tuberculosis in between 98 and 99 per cent of the reactors which are slaughtered under Federal supervision.

The years during which these investigations have been in progress have seen the live-stock owners and the live-stock sanitary authorities awoken to a realization of the necessity and importance of combatting the spread of tuberculosis which has already made inroads in practically every section of the United States. This is especially true of the sections where intensive live-stock breeding and dairying have been practiced. In the South where this industry has been maintained in its infancy largely on account of the prevalence of the Texas fever, cattle ticks, and the lack of diversified farming interests, the rapid eradication of these ticks and the progress of the propaganda for diversified farming is making a new and large field for the development of both the beef and dairy cattle industries. The cattle in these sections are now but slightly infected with tuberculosis, and it would seem to be of special importance that these sections be given protection from the introduction of tuberculous cattle from the infected localities.

Forty-seven of the States require the tuberculin test as a qualification for the entry of dairy or breeding cattle, but the owners of valuable herds have realized that a greater health insurance is obtained in the purchase of cattle from herds which are officially known to be free from tuberculosis.

This has led to the establishment by this bureau and by some of the States of what are known as accredited tuberculin-tested herds. This plan is meeting with great favor, especially among the breeders of purebred and registered cattle who recognize in it a medium for increasing the volume of their business and for protecting their own valuable herds when pure bred cattle of other blood lines are introduced for improving the strains.

So that the proposition presented by Dr. Mohler in writing stands uncontradicted to-day. That being the statement of the man most conversant with that proposition of any mortal on earth, does this committee want it understood as a fact that it has had so little effect upon the Department of Agriculture that, knowing that the annual loss from tuberculosis is from \$25,000,000 to \$75,000,000; that we and our allies need the meat; that we know the eradication can be accomplished; that the Department of Agriculture has been sending appeals to the live-stock producers of this country to speed up the production of meat because we need it more than we need ordnance and munitions of war—knowing all these facts, will you bring this indictment against the Department of Agriculture, will you charge it with knowing these facts, and yet that it has not put itself in a position where it can use more than \$250,000 to protect 130,000,000 food-producing animals, cattle and hogs? Will you say that, and yet that it finds a place to use \$620,000 that can possibly apply to only 20,000,000 food-producing animals? If the gentlemen who are standing here defending the position of the committee desire to put the Secretary of Agriculture before the country in such a position as that, let it be so. Will you prevent the Secretary saying to the country, "Speed up, breed to the greatest capacity," when the meat producers of the United States, who are endeavoring to put the last possible pound upon every brute, are losing millions of dollars every day, and that he can use only \$250,000 in the fight against the tuberculosis which causes a large measure of this loss, let it be between them and the Secretary. So far as I am concerned, I would rather believe that the Secretary does not desire to assume full responsibility for that "tempestuous campaign," but desires Congress to take its full share of the responsibility, which it would do if this amendment carries.

Let me explain to you why tuberculosis is so effective in losses. It is because it does not strike the animals so that the public will know anything about it until they are advanced in age. Therefore there is an inducement for every man who suspects that there will be a loss in his herd from tuberculosis to send his swine or his cattle to the market long before they are mature.

That is one of the large causes that is to-day driving cattle and hogs daily to the market before maturity. Yet the Department of Agriculture appeals to the people of this country to make every animal that is shipped carry as much meat as possible. Yet knowing that the greatest source of loss is tuberculosis, and knowing that it can be eradicated, does the gentleman



charge that the department refuses to put itself in a position to remove that large source of loss?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Just for a question.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I want to ask the gentleman what would have happened in this country when the foot-and-mouth disease broke out if Congress had appropriated only \$250,000 to cope with that disease? It would have been all over the country, would it not?

Mr. SLOAN. All over the country; yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Is it not true that in Germany, where both foot-and-mouth disease and tuberculosis are comparatively unchecked, the losses from tuberculosis are greater than those from the foot-and-mouth disease?

Mr. SLOAN. That is an important fact. In the State of Minnesota the average loss resulting from hopeless reaction is 37. On the market of those that react 80 per cent are not condemned even in part, only 20 per cent. Of those that react and are condemned in part 50 per cent of the apparent value is saved. This bill will allow the Government to go to each State and in cooperation pay whatever a fair share of the loss may be. How do I know that? Dr. Kiernan, who has been frequently quoted, states that is the way the Government did in driving tuberculosis out of the District of Columbia, and under a law practically like this, so that this is within the law and within the bill. The terms of this bill would permit any reasonable arrangement among owners, States, and the Federal Government in strict line with the method outlined by Dr. Mohler. Let us not forget that this may be a long war, and what we do should be speedily done. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] has severely arraigned the Department of Agriculture because that department has not made arrangement for the expenditure of half a million dollars to control tuberculosis in food-producing animals. In fairness to the Department of Agriculture and the great man who presides over it, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the first appropriation ever recommended by any department of this Government for the control of tuberculosis in live stock was recommended by the present Secretary of Agriculture in his annual report of last year. [Applause.] He said:

There remains, however, the problem of eliminating the disease from farm animals in order to prevent losses estimated at \$25,000,000 a year in the United States. This is the greatest problem confronting the live-stock industry of the country.

That is what the Secretary of Agriculture said last year, and this is the first recommendation ever made in this country, either for the eradication of tuberculosis or for its control.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I can not. Another thing, the Secretary of Agriculture, in his report, outlines to Congress three methods by which the problem can be approached: First, the eradication from pure-bred herds; second, the eradication in hogs; and, third, the eradication from restricted areas.

The Department of Agriculture has not been remiss in its duty in this matter; on the contrary, it has been progressive, up to date, and has laid the facts before Congress. Let me say also that the current Agricultural appropriation act is the first appropriation act ever passed by this Congress which carries an appropriation for the purpose of attacking the problem of tuberculosis in food-producing animals.

Acting on the suggestion of the Secretary of Agriculture last year, this committee, which has fallen so far in the estimation of the gentleman from Nebraska, who is always interesting, entertaining, and active, appropriated \$75,000 that the department might have the funds with which to work out a plan that would be effective against the spread of tuberculosis in live stock.

What are the facts? The department estimated for an appropriation of \$187,000 for this purpose. Dr. Mohler, the chief of this bureau, was before this committee. The committee had an opportunity to cross-examine him, and it did cross-examine him. I defy any gentleman on the proponent's side of this proposition to show that Dr. Mohler, in his testimony, said that he could use a single dollar more than was asked for in the estimates, namely, \$187,000.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I can not yield just now.

Mr. LITTLE. Very well; I yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. LEVER. Very well, I yield for a question.

Mr. LITTLE. Is it not a fact that the States appropriated money to eradicate tuberculosis long before the Department of Agriculture suggested it?

Mr. LEVER. What has that to do with this matter? It does not contradict me. I said the Federal Government never made any appropriation.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Was not there an appropriation made in the District of Columbia in 1909?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, a little territory 10 miles square. What is that compared with the area of the United States, stretching from Canada to the Gulf and from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean. Yes; there was an appropriation, but it was not carried in this bill. They did eradicate it in this area down to 1 per cent. Does the gentleman think that we could sanely act on that kind of information or that kind of a result?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The work extended into Virginia and Maryland.

Mr. LEVER. The statement has been made that tuberculosis could be eradicated. I desire to say to you that the testimony of Dr. A. D. Melvin, former chief of this bureau, who has since passed beyond the river, before the Committee on Agriculture last year, said that there was not a nation in the world that undertook successfully to eradicate tuberculosis. He said that there were one or two little islands that were doing it—the island of Guernsey is attempting to do it and the island of Jersey is attempting to do it. Germany undertook to do it and failed utterly. Germany now is doing what we are undertaking to do, namely, to control the disease. Germany has not made much success of that, for the testimony shows that from 60 to 80 per cent of its cattle are affected by this disease. That is the testimony of Dr. Melvin.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I can not yield.

Mr. SLOAN. For a brief question.

Mr. LEVER. Very well, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read one sentence:

Tuberculosis can be eradicated from all the cattle and all the swine in this Union, otherwise the Department of Agriculture would not have embarked on such a tempestuous campaign.

Mr. LEVER. That is Dr. Mohler.

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Dr. Melvin says it has never been eradicated wherever attempted in the civilized world, except in a very restricted area.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does not the testimony show that it has been practically eliminated in the District of Columbia?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, if the gentleman had listened to my statement, he would not take up my time by asking such a question. I have already stated that.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have been here all of the time, and I never have heard the gentleman admit it.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from South Carolina was the first chairman of this committee which ever advocated it, the gentleman to the contrary notwithstanding. The gentleman from South Carolina, if he may say it himself, has been in the front rank of progressive workers in agriculture in this country. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. I admit all that; but I want to say to the gentleman that last year I got an amendment in the bill for this, and when the bill came back from the conference committee the amendment was stricken out.

Mr. LEVER. I do not remember it. Let me say this: We want to approach this subject sanely and calmly. The committee, looking over the amendments, hearing the testimony, not only gave the Department of Agriculture every cent that it asked—\$187,000—but we increased the amount to \$250,000 upon our own initiative, and we did it because we recognized the gravity of the problem, because we recognized it is one of the big problems of this country; but we did not make the sum \$500,000 or a million dollars because we were assured by the men testifying before the committee that \$250,000 would be the maximum amount which they could expend wisely and economically in this work. If this committee had come in here with a million-dollar appropriation for this work, without an estimate, in the face of this uncontradicted testimony, half a dozen men would have been criticizing the committee for acting in such an extravagant way with the people's money.

Reference has been made to the item carrying the cattle-tick appropriation. There is absolutely no comparison between these items, and for this reason: The cattle-tick work was started in this country in 1906 under Secretary James Wilson. It was started with an appropriation of \$82,500, and it was held at that sum for several years—certainly below \$200,000 for several years—and it was held at this low figure in order that the public might be educated to know what the situation was and to take advantage of the work. When the cattle-tick work first



began in the South many communities absolutely refused to touch it with a 40-foot pole. The district of my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] voted it down some years ago, but after propaganda, after education, and the people knew the situation, they voted it up, and they are doing work down there. Let me say another thing: The testimony before this committee is that neither the States nor the communities are prepared for this work at this time. I make that statement, and I challenge the contradiction of it—except in a very limited way.

What this committee is doing is to furnish the department with the machinery to approach this subject in the spirit of educating the people, both in the manner of segregating the diseased cattle from the well ones and in the manner of furnishing certificates to pure-bred cattle that are being used for breeding purposes throughout the United States. There is no proposition here to compensate owners for slaughtering cattle, and it seems to me that an appropriation of \$250,000 is sufficient to give all of the propaganda work necessary in this matter and at the same time furnish all the tuberculin-test work that the department can properly and profitably do during the next fiscal year. When the time comes that the public has reached a position to utilize this money, I say to you that this committee will stand ready to give the department every dollar that it asks for. I remember in my own cross-examination of a witness last year I said I recognized the tremendous importance of this problem and that we would not quibble over dollars and cents, and if the department could show us it had the machinery with which to use the money wisely in the great work which it has initiated through the help of this committee and this Congress I would gladly advocate the expenditure. Some gentlemen have the idea that you can handle the tuberculosis situation as you would the hog-cholera situation. You can not do it. We have a serum with which we can prevent hog cholera in large measure. We have discovered no serum with which we can prevent tuberculosis in hogs or cattle. It is true we have discovered a tuberculin by which we can ascertain if the animal is infected or not, but beyond that we have no remedy except the absolute slaughter of the animal or its segregation from the herds that may be infected. I trust this amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired. All time has expired. The Chair will direct the Clerk to again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

The Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan) there were—ayes 47, noes 64.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed Mr. LEVER and Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 62, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 19, strike out "\$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$400,000."

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. ANDERSON) there were—ayes 37, noes 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for the eradication of southern cattle ticks, \$620,420, of which sum \$50,000 may be used for live stock and dairy demonstration work, in cooperation with the States Relations Service, and of this amount no part shall be used in the purchase of animals: *Provided, however*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in the purchase of materials for or in the construction of dipping vats upon land not owned solely by the United States, except at fairs or expositions where the Department of Agriculture makes exhibits or demonstrations; nor shall any part of this appropriation be used in the purchase of materials or mixtures for use in dipping vats except in experimental or demonstration work carried on by the officials or agents of the Bureau of Animal Industry;

For all necessary expenses for investigations and experiments in dairy industry, cooperative investigations of the dairy industry in the various States, inspection of renovated-butter factories and markets, \$364,390.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to move an amendment to the paragraph just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 21, strike out "\$620,420" and insert "\$250,000."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the amendment is not germane to the section of the bill which is under discussion. That paragraph has already been read and the paragraph preceding it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from South Carolina that while it is true the paragraph has been read and the Clerk had read the preceding one, the gentleman from Nebraska rose when the Clerk was in the midst of reading the first paragraph and the Chair told him he had not concluded the reading, therefore he did not recognize him at the time.

Mr. LEVER. Then, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I submit this amendment following the policy that has just been stated in the preceding paragraph, a policy to be applied, I hope will be governed, by neither latitude nor longitude. I take it that one of the largest propositions that we have before the country at this time is the production of food. It is just as important as the production of ordnance or the production of munitions for the purpose of winning the great war. The cry for food from "over there" is louder than the appeal for munitions or men. The meat food of this country is largely confined to the 130,000,000 cattle and hogs, all subject to tuberculosis. The \$620,420, which I move to reduce to \$250,000, designed to protect only 20,000,000 cattle from cattle tick, is evidently intended for the purpose of increasing the food production of this country. It can possibly affect only 11 or 12 States. The proposition to increase the tuberculosis item from \$250,000 to \$500,000 has just been beaten by a vote coming largely from the cattle-tick States. The tuberculosis amendment that has been before the House affects 48 States. That proposition should be a pace maker for economy of food production. It affects 48 States and 130,000,000 food animals. This item can possibly affect only 20,000,000 animals, all cattle, with an average value about the same as the hogs and cattle, numbering 130,000,000.

Now, then, it seems to me that if an appropriation of \$250,000 is a sufficient response to the "tempestuous campaign" the Department of Agriculture has inaugurated—I use the language of the head of the Bureau of Animal Industry—affecting 130,000,000 food animals, for one that can affect only 20,000,000 animals \$250,000 would be the height of liberality and generosity. More than that I understand it is claimed that 51 per cent of the possible area of the activity of the cattle tick has been cleared, which would reduce the number to be exposed to 10,000,000 head. Then it would be for 10,000,000 exposed there is protection of \$620,000; while 130,000,000 food animals exposed to tuberculosis there is protection of only \$250,000; I think in fairness to the tax-paying people of this country, as well as to the food producers, that if they are going to hold the tuberculosis appropriation down to \$250,000, \$250,000 would be a lavish sum to give for the eradication of the cattle tick. That \$620,000 for 10,000,000 animals exposed to cattle tick means 6½ cents for every head. Which \$250,000 for tuberculosis for 130,000,000 animals is one-fifth of 1 cent per animal as protection against tuberculosis. A ratio of 31 to 1. In other words, Sir Bovis, the royal tick bearer, is given thirty-one times the consideration that his more humble fellow who bears, or might bear, the wasting tubercles.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for investigations and experiments in animal husbandry; for experiments in animal feeding and breeding, including cooperation with the State agricultural experiment stations, including repairs and additions to and erection of buildings absolutely necessary to carry on the experiments, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, rent outside of the District of Columbia, and all other necessary expenses, \$308,680: *Provided*, That of the sum thus appropriated \$37,840 may be used for experiments in the breeding and maintenance of horses for military purposes: *Provided further*, That of the sum thus appropriated \$61,040 may be used for experiments in poultry feeding and breeding: *Provided further*, That of the sum thus appropriated \$8,000 may be used for the equipment of the United States Sheep Experiment Station in Fremont County, Idaho, including repairs and additions to and the erection of necessary buildings to furnish facilities for the investigation of problems pertaining to the sheep and wool industry on the farms and ranges of the Western States.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want some information on this item. My recollection is this is the first time that this appropriation was carried, except that last year the amount was \$12,280.

Mr. LEVER. What item?

Mr. COX. This sheep farm in Fremont County, Idaho. How was that money expended, and what has been the result?

Mr. LEVER. The item of \$8,000 carried here is a continuance of the work that was done some years ago in the State of Wyoming when we introduced into that State some Corriedale sheep from Australia with a view of trying to improve not only



the wool production but the meat production of our sheep. Last year the proposition came to transfer this work into the State of Idaho. That proposition was, I think, submitted here on the floor, but did not receive favorable consideration by the House. It was put into the bill in the Senate. The Senate conferees insisted and the House conferees finally gave in, so that the herd of sheep that was being used for experimental purposes in the State of Wyoming has been transferred to the State of Idaho. I think they have there about 28,000 acres of land on which they are experimenting along the lines of grazing, feeding, breeding, and so forth.

Mr. COX. Is that on Government land?

Mr. LEVER. That is on Government land; yes. Now, this appropriation was used largely in building fences, corrals, and little houses for the protection of the sheep in lambing time.

Mr. COX. Last year the appropriation was carried in the amount of \$12,280 and this year it is reduced to \$8,000?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. COX. Does the department feel like they could get along with \$8,000?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; so we gave the department all they asked for.

Mr. COX. How are these sheep finally disposed of?

Mr. LEVER. Some are sold and the wool is sold also.

Mr. COX. Are they sold at public auction or by private sales?

Mr. LEVER. I am not sure of that, but I think the general rule is to sell products of the Department of Agriculture at public auction; but I am not sure about this.

Mr. COX. Are we only dealing with these Corriedale sheep that the Agricultural Department bought a few years ago?

Mr. LEVER. No; they have other sheep there.

Mr. COX. How many head of sheep are there now?

Mr. LEVER. There are between 4,000 and 5,000 head of sheep.

Mr. COX. And 28,000 acres of land?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. But this money is to be used only in building corrals and housing.

Mr. COX. And experimenting with the feeding and the growing of sheep generally?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Can the chairman of the committee inform me as to where and how extensively these experiments in the breeding and maintenance of horses for military purposes are being carried on?

Mr. LEVER. We have three stations; one at Front Royal, Va.; the Morgan farm up in Vermont; and a farm in Kentucky; but just in what part of Kentucky I am not able to say.

Mr. WALSH. Is the purpose to furnish horses for the military service or just to experiment and find out what particular breed of animal is best adapted?

Mr. LEVER. This appropriation was put into this bill over the protest of the chairman several years ago. The prime purpose of this is to undertake at Front Royal and in Kentucky to develop a better military horse. The work in Vermont, at Middlebury, is for the purpose, if possible, of preserving the Morgan horse and giving it a wider use in this country. Then, we also had a station out in Colorado, where we undertook to develop a carriage horse. That work is being conducted somewhat but not very extensively.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman know whether the Military Establishment have received any of these horses from these stations during the past year?

Mr. LEVER. I could not tell the gentleman that. I would hardly think so, because this work at Front Royal and down in Kentucky has been going on only a very few years.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman know how many animals they have?

Mr. LEVER. They have 39 stallions there now.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to have some information from the chairman as to whether there is any activity in any of the departments of the Government looking to increasing the production of sheep as a general proposition—no particular class, but as a general proposition?

Mr. LEVER. There is. Last year, largely at the suggestion of the department and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], there was inserted in the Agricultural appropriation bill, I think, the sum of about \$25,000 for carrying on sheep demonstration in this country, particularly along the Atlantic coast belt. This year we have increased the appropriation about \$14,000.

Mr. FESS. That would indicate, then, that the work started last year is promising.

Mr. LEVER. The work started last year, according to my information, is very promising. The gentleman recognizes the tremendous necessity for that kind of work.

Mr. FESS. I will say to my friend that in years gone by almost every farm had a bunch of sheep. That seems to have been discontinued, and the product as a meat product seems to be very essential, and a bunch of sheep is rather of value to a farm than a detriment, and I wondered whether we would ultimately come to a position of producing no sheep.

Mr. LEVER. I would say to the gentleman from Ohio that I was very greatly surprised, in talking to a large sheep grower in the West, to learn that out of the total consumption of wool in this country of 600,000,000 pounds we produced only about 200,000,000 pounds. And I think there is no subject more worthy of consideration than the matter of increasing the sheep production in this country.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have on previous occasions when this bill has been under consideration expressed my opinion of the item for experiments in the breeding and maintenance of horses for military purposes, and I did not intend to say anything about it at this time, but it has been brought up by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and I desire again to express the opinion that it is one of the few items of this bill which might very properly go out. I believe that expenditure is wasteful and does not result in accomplishing any good purpose. If it were wise and proper that the Government should go into the business of experimenting in the breeding of horses necessary and useful for military purposes, it should be done in a large way. It is not necessary to do it at all. The way we have been doing it is simply the frittering away of public money to the benefit and advantage of a few people in three localities.

But I did not rise for the purpose of discussing that particular part of the paragraph. Reference has been made to the portion of the paragraph relating to the sheep farm in Idaho. On this farm experiments are to be made with the Corriedale band of sheep bred from a band imported some years ago on an appropriation which I was somewhat instrumental in securing. These sheep were kept for several years in Wyoming, but the people who had charge of them there, and who cared for them very well and very successfully, concluded they did not care to continue their cooperation with the Government along those lines, and believed it would be wise to transfer those sheep and others, and the experimental work that was being carried on, to Idaho, where a considerable acreage of public land could be secured for the purpose of carrying on sheep experiments along various lines. Our people who were interested and informed generally held this view. I think the Idaho farm has not been running long enough to produce any very definite results, but I believe there are many experiments that can be carried on there that will be valuable.

The Corriedale sheep imported from Australia and New Zealand are proving a valuable addition to the wool and mutton producing flocks of the range States. The breed is gradually being utilized by a great many growers very much to their advantage. The Corriedale, carrying the characteristics of the merino, useful for all purposes for which the merino, either of the pure or mixed blood, is valuable, is a larger sheep with a heavier fleece.

It is a very valuable sheep for very considerable portions of the country, and the experiments that have and will be made with these and other classes and grades and breeds of sheep on the Idaho farm I believe will be very useful.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state whether or not these investigations that have been carried on in Fremont County, Idaho, will prove of any value or benefit in determining the extent to which sheep might be raised in other sections of the country, or whether it simply shows how successfully they may be raised in Idaho?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know that they would cast much light on the question as to the wisdom and advisability of raising sheep on eastern farms, but they will cast a great deal of light on questions of breeding and feeding, of weight, of wool and mutton production, and quality; determinations of questions that, once made and decided in Idaho, will be useful everywhere that sheep are grown.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.



Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I have been particularly interested in the argument of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], because the illustration he gives of the apparent practicality and success of the experiment in sheep raising in Idaho, which was originally introduced into Wyoming, is based exactly upon the argument which supports the horse-breeding station in Middlebury, Vt. It further has a rather interesting history, inasmuch as the sheep which are now being imported into this country for experimental breeding purposes may be offspring of sheep that were developed in Vermont originally and sent to South Africa and Australia and those other regions. And this, as men interested in the sheep-breeding business know, became the so-called American merino, an adaptation of the Spanish merino made by Vermonters nearly a hundred years ago, and, until the Civil War put an end to the sheep industry in that State, Vermont was the chief furnishing State for the higher specialized type of the so-called Vermont merino. That development came from such kinds of experimentation in Vermont as the gentleman now claims would, in Idaho and Wyoming, with respect to sheep, be a good thing for the country.

Now, Vermont, again, true to type, is undertaking to breed from her famous Vermont Morgan horses a horse adapted to military purposes, so that if you will give us time enough at Middlebury we will have it so that all who are now on foot may ride horseback. [Laughter.] Even beggars may then ride on horseback. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. How long ago was that established?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Some years back, so far as its history is concerned.

Mr. MONDELL. Was it not about 20 years ago? The gentleman is not quite accurate about the Corriedale sheep. They were brought from Australia, not from Vermont.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I did not say they were brought from Vermont.

Mr. MONDELL. They were, if I am not mistaken, developed not from Vermont merinos but from Rambouillet merinos from southern France, so that the reference made by the gentleman from Vermont in regard to the merino sheep does not cover the Corriedale proposition.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. All right; you can go as far into the herald's college for the pedigree of your sheep as you want to, but I am depending upon some facts that are well known in Vermont whether they are known in Wyoming or not. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. They also apply to the Wyoming merino.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I did not say that this particular sheep was the result of any experimentation in Vermont. You compare the virtue of that sheep with the so-called merino sheep for certain stable qualities. That particular sheep was developed in Vermont, and he was the type of a development which I was citing to you as an illustration. Then I said that probably we will get similarly successful results from horse breeding in Vermont after we have developed things. But coming back to the point, I want to use the gentleman's argument for sheep to defeat his own argument against the horse. [Applause.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I know of nothing in the way of the live-stock industry that needs development more than the sheep industry of this country. If the American people do not wake up along those lines and do something, I do not know what is going to occur. Wool is an absolute necessity to our lives, to our health, and to our happiness, particularly to those living in northern climates, and yet the sheep is actually disappearing not only from our country, but practically from all the sheep-growing countries of the earth.

At the last general revision of the tariff the facts developed showed that we produced in this country annually about 280,000,000 pounds of wool and we imported about 320,000,000 pounds. Recognizing the necessity of cheap wool and cheap woolen goods, the duty was taken entirely off of wool, and wool was placed upon the free list, with the hope that it would do one or two or possibly more things—that it would give us cheap clothing, or possibly it would stimulate the production of sheep. It has done neither.

Now, what are we going to do? We have got to have wool. It has got to be grown. It has got to be produced somewhere. The sheep ranges of the West are practically broken up. They are now grazing the foothills of the Sierra Nevada and the Rocky Mountains. There is no place where sheep can be grown except upon the farm, and I know of no organization able to deal with the matter other than those living on the farms throughout the country.

Some years ago the people of Pennsylvania took up this question through their banking and agricultural organizations. I

have kept up with that question by keeping in touch with the bankers' organizations in Pennsylvania and in touch with the agricultural organizations, and as a result of the money which the bankers of Pennsylvania actually put into the sheep industry in distributing the sheep among the farmers I am reliably informed that in the last five or six years they have actually increased their flocks and herds 100 per cent, and they have added to the taxable value of their property approximately \$4,000,000.

But they soon encountered the archenemy of the sheep, and that is the dog. I had some correspondence with the secretary of agriculture of Pennsylvania about that this summer. The bankers' organizations and the Farmers' Alliance of Pennsylvania forced and compelled an unwilling and reluctant legislature to pass a law which practically legislated the dog out of existence, and I think the State of Pennsylvania, in a manner, has controlled that situation. Now, as to my own State, I undertake to say that there are more dogs in the State of Indiana than there are sheep.

I undertake to say that that is practically the rule in every State of this Union. There are as many dogs upon the farms as there are sheep. Something has got to be done. The Agricultural Department can do a tremendous amount of work, and a lot can be done by local organizations and institutions.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I had the same matter presented to me during the holiday week. My uncertainty was whether Congress could go into that field and whether the States would not have to be depended upon? What is the gentleman's opinion about that?

Mr. COX. I think we have got ultimately to depend upon the States, but I do think Congress can do a lot of research work along the plan laid down in this item here.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I have in preparation a bill which proposes a Federal tax on the predatory sheep-killing dogs, which I propose to introduce later.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will put the tax high enough, I will gladly support it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when this war is over we shall be faced with a debt that will stagger humanity. Every penny of it has got to be paid. Not a dollar of it can be repudiated. We have got to begin the growing of raw material to enable the manufacturers of this country to keep their wheels moving after peace has come to us.

In 1910 there were 57,216,000 sheep in the United States. In 1917 the number had decreased to 48,483,000, a loss of 8,733,000 head from 1910 to 1917.

In 1890 the number of sheep in the United States was 44,336,072. In 1917 the number had increased to 48,483,000, or in 27 years the number of sheep increased 4,147,000, while the population increased during the same period of time upward of 25,000,000.

There is no place where sheep can be grown to-day in this country except on small farms by the man with 80 or 160 acres. Here must be the future home of the sheep. Every encouragement should be given the American farmer to induce him to go into the sheep industry.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate is closed on the paragraph. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Meat inspection, Bureau of Animal Industry: For additional expenses in carrying out the provisions of the meat-inspection act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. L., 674), there is hereby appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of \$477,200.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MONDELL: Page 16, line 23, strike out the figures "\$477,200" and insert in lieu of the same "\$577,200, of which sum \$100,000, or as much thereof as may be necessary, may be used to defray the expenses of the inspection of horses slaughtered for export and the meat products from the same."

Mr. LEVER. I reserve a point of order on that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, there never was a time in the history of the world when the meat shortage was felt so widely and so acutely as it is at this time. Among the populations of Europe, particularly of Italy, of France, and of the German States, the use of horse meat has been common and general for a great many years. In view of the meat shortage and the use of horse meat by foreign peoples, some of the horse growers of our western country took up with me and with the



Food Administration the question of the utilization of such of our horses as are not useful or valuable for military or ordinary work or pleasure purposes, with a view of having them utilized to relieve the meat shortage across the water. I took the matter up with the United States Food Administration, and have a letter signed by Mr. E. M. Hilton, which is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 31, 1917.

Hon. W. F. MONDELL,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MONDELL: Your letter of December 19 addressed to the Food Administration has been handed to me for reply.

The Food Administration also has received many letters with reference to the use of horse meat in place of beef and has placed before the allies' representatives the possibility of securing large supplies of horse meat in this country and is now awaiting their advice. It is quite possible that they may be glad to buy such meat, but until negotiations are further advanced there is, so far as I know, no available market, since the people of this country have not yet learned to eat horse meat.

I thank you for bringing this matter to our attention and can assure you that it has more than once been brought before the representatives of the foreign Governments.

Yours, very truly,

UNITED STATES FOOD ADMINISTRATION.  
By E. M. HILTON.

There are horses available for slaughter all over the country. That is particularly true of the range country. The number of horses unavailable for ordinary use has been increasing as the variety of uses and the general use of horses have decreased, until there are a very large number of horses undersized and otherwise unfitted for ordinary purposes, although perfectly sound, healthy, and usable for meat. I do not believe that our people are likely to use horse meat to any considerable extent. My amendment does not contemplate inspection for such purposes but for export only. Horse meat is, however, being used in many of the large cities, slaughtered and inspected locally, and sold locally within State lines. At one time I think there was some inspection of horse meat under the Agricultural Department. There has been none for a number of years. I am proposing an increase of \$100,000 in this appropriation to be used for the purpose of horse and horse-meat inspection for export.

I noticed in one of the newspapers of this city yesterday under a New York date the following:

SEEK \$100,000 FUND TO BOOM HORSES AS FOOD—VETERINARY SURGEONS URGE REESTABLISHMENT OF INSPECTION AS MEAT-CONSERVATION MOVE.

NEW YORK, January 26.

A resolution requesting Congress "to appropriate immediately \$100,000 to reestablish the inspection of horse meat," so it may be made salable, was adopted by veterinary surgeons from New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut at a conference here to-day. The sale of horse meat, the conferees determined, will be of invaluable aid in preventing a food shortage and reducing the high cost of living.

"The inspection of horse meat was abandoned in 1914," Dr. W. Horace Hoskins, dean of the New York State Veterinary College and one of the leaders in the movement, said in a statement. "If it is restored," he continued, "thousands of horses from the western ranges, unsuited for draft work because of their light weight can be placed on the dinner table."

"There are thousands of these ponies," he said, "which have been refused by the allies and this country, but they are as fat as moles and would be a splendid substitute for our vanishing beefsteaks and mutton chops."

"By turning these horses upon the market as meat we can bring the price of meat down to 15 cents a pound. They are offered for sale at from \$15 to \$25 a head on the hoof. I have received telegrams offering as many as 6,000 in one consignment."

I have had some correspondence with the Secretary of Agriculture on the subject and he evidences his interest and explains the situation in a letter, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, January 11, 1918.

Hon. F. W. MONDELL,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MONDELL: Pressure of work has prevented me from replying earlier to your letter of December 18, inclosing a copy of a communication from Mr. David Davis, of Badwater, Wyo., relative to the utilization of range horses for meat.

As I wrote you on July 8, the department understands that some horses are being slaughtered for food in this country in local abattoirs. The inspection of these animals is conducted under the supervision of the city boards of health, and the meat is sold for local consumption. The department, therefore, has no definite information concerning the matter and has no means of knowing whether there would be any additional local demand for meat of this kind.

There is no specific law governing the inspection and slaughter of horses, and there is nothing to prevent the interstate shipment or exportation of horse meat, provided it is correctly labeled. All articles of food, however, must comply with the provisions of the food and drugs act of June 30, 1916, if shipped in interstate commerce.

Very truly, yours,

D. F. HOUSTON, Secretary.

Mr. COX. Why was Government inspection of horse meat for export stopped? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know. Possibly it was because few horses were utilized for that purpose, although at one time there was quite a considerable industry in the Pacific northwest

in the slaughter of horses and the canning of horse meat for export purposes.

Mr. COX. Can not the department use the fund that is now used for the inspection of other kinds of meat to pay such inspectors?

Mr. MONDELL. I doubt it, because our inspection law applies to the inspection of the animals named in the law, and horses are not included.

Mr. COX. Does the law name the animals?

Mr. MONDELL. It does.

Mr. COX. Or the regulations?

Mr. MONDELL. The law itself. Cattle, sheep, hogs, and goats are the animals named in the law. This item is subject to a point of order, but I do believe that it is a matter of such importance that the appropriation should be made, because if our Secretary of State makes arrangements with foreign countries for the use of meat of this kind, a very large market will be secured, and there will be a very great relief from the present drain upon other classes of meat. As a nation we stand pledged to see that our allies receive a certain amount of meat from our supplies. The food administrator is urging for the curtailment of our use of meat in order that we may supply our allies. In this situation we should, if possible, utilize abroad our available supply of a kind of meat which the civilian populations of certain of our allies have used for years.

Mr. WALSH. Would not the appropriation of this sum lead to an increase in the slaughter of horses of light draft, for which there is now a very great demand for the Military Establishment?

Mr. MONDELL. It certainly would lead to the slaughtering of a great many horses, provided a market could be secured for such horse meat.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the gentleman think we had better conserve our horses for the Army rather than encourage their slaughter?

Mr. MONDELL. I will say to my friend that the horses which it is proposed to slaughter are horses that are too light or otherwise unfit for military purposes, and horses that for other reasons beside their size are not fitted for military use.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the time of the gentleman from Wyoming be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. No one has any thought of encouraging the slaughter of horses fit for military purposes. There is no possibility of that being done because of the fact that the horse fit for military purposes brings a price at which the use of his meat for food would be entirely prohibitive. Horses suitable for military purposes bring more per pound than the best beef animal in the country. So animals of that sort would not be utilized for meat. It would afford a market for the very large number of horses all over the country and a still larger number in the range country. These are horses that for various reasons are not available or useful for ordinary purposes, but are perfectly sound, would add very largely to the world's meat supply, and could be utilized by those people abroad who for years have been eating horse meat.

Mr. WALSH. My question was prompted by the statement the gentleman read in the clipping to the effect that horses would be used that were not suitable for draft purposes, and I thought that there might be some distinction between horses suitable for draft work and horses suitable for military purposes.

Mr. MONDELL. Perhaps the gentleman did not hear the whole article. That question was discussed, and it was suggested that the horses available for this purpose were horses that could not be used for draft purposes or driving or military purposes. I have here a letter from a constituent who knows and states the situation in regard to horses in the range country.

TO RELIEVE THE MEAT SHORTAGE.

BADWATER, WYO., December 10, 1917.

Hon. FRANK MONDELL,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Can you not draw the attention of Congress to the thousands of horses that are running on the range and elsewhere which are unfit for artillery, cavalry work, or saddle, but would make tons of nutritious meat for the people who are accustomed to eating horse. There are hundreds and hundreds which are too small for work animals and too awkward for saddlers. There is now no market for these animals, and if they could be sold for beef it would leave the feed they are now eating for the desirable ones.

Trusting the Nation will see this unused meat supply, I am,

DAVID DAVIS.



These perfectly healthy animals are now eating grass that ought to be utilized by other animals. Their use would make a market for the stock and greatly relieve the food situation among the civilian population among those of our allies accustomed to such meat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in six minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in six minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, this is an item that I believe should be favorably considered by the committee. The question of supplying a sufficient amount of meat to the people of this country and for our allies during the period of the war is a very important one. There are in the country to-day, it is estimated, about four or five millions of horses available for slaughter.

Mr. COX. Did the gentleman say 5,000,000 horses available for slaughter?

Mr. NORTON. Available for slaughter, which can be used without injury to the horse and without in any way endangering the supply of horses that are needed to be used for work on the farms of the country, in our cities, and for military purposes.

Mr. COX. How many horses are there in the United States?

Mr. NORTON. There are about 22,000,000.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state who made the estimate that there are 5,000,000 horses available for slaughter? Was it made by some department of the Government?

Mr. NORTON. No; that is an estimate that has been given out, I believe, by well-known horsemen in North Dakota and Montana who are well acquainted with the condition of the horse industry of the country. I will say to the gentleman that this is a question to which has been given considerable thought and study. It has been taken up with the Food Administration of this country and with the food administrations of England, France, and Italy. The slaughter of horses in this country for meat for export trade is considered a very practical matter.

I shall not be surprised at all if within a very short time the Congress provides for the establishment in the country of a plant for the slaughtering of horses and for the export of horse meat. Horse meat is just as wholesome and just as nourishing as is the meat of cattle. It has been used quite generally for many years in European countries.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not want to rob the gentleman of his time, but this is a new proposition and I would like to know whether any department of the Government has suggested that we begin to use horse meat for food in the United States.

Mr. NORTON. I do not know that any department has yet recommended the use of horse meat in the United States, but I know the Department of Agriculture and the Food Administration has already considered this proposition and expressed the view that it was practicable and that the time has arrived when serious consideration should be given to this source of meat supply. I took this matter up with the Food Administration and the Department of Agriculture a year ago, and they then expressed much interest in it. I think it would be a somewhat difficult matter to educate our people in this country for some little time yet to the use of horse meat for food.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman knows that my amendment applies only to the inspection of horse meat for export.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I notice the administration is suggesting that we reduce food consumption in this country in order to send meat and wheat to our friends across the water. I would like to know if we are going to be reduced to horse meat in the United States while we are sending our beef and wheat abroad? It does not seem to me that that is quite an American proposition.

Mr. NORTON. If the gentleman will give his powerful influence to the passage of this amendment, as I trust he will, it will help to avoid that very condition which he seems greatly to fear. It will help to supply our allies with wholesome and nourishing meat and enable us to keep a great deal of our beef for home consumption.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It will probably get to our own soldiers if we export it, and I am not quite ready to accept horse meat for a diet either for our soldiers or the people

in the United States. I want to know if any department of the Government has approved of the proposition contained in the amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield for me to answer?

Mr. NORTON. No; I have not the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is clearly subject to a point of order; but inasmuch as the gentleman from Wyoming called my attention to it this morning as we were coming into the Hall, I am going to ask unanimous consent that the item may be passed over without prejudice, the point of order being reserved until I can consult certain gentlemen in the department about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the paragraph and amendment with the point of order pending against it may be passed over until he calls it up later.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does that mean that there will be an opportunity for discussion, since the gentleman has had the debate limited?

Mr. LEVER. If the point of order is withdrawn, I will agree that there shall be proper discussion.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the gentleman will permit debate on it if the proposition comes up again?

Mr. LEVER. I shall if I take the point of order off.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think it is such a radical proposition that we should come down to a horse-meat basis in the United States, or even abroad, so far as soldiers are concerned, that we ought to have a little discussion of it on the floor.

Mr. LEVER. So do I.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Plant Industry: One physiologist and pathologist, who shall be chief of bureau, \$5,000; 1 assistant to the chief, \$3,000; 1 executive assistant in seed distribution, \$2,500; 1 officer in charge of publications, \$2,250; 1 landscape gardener, \$1,800; 1 officer in charge of records, \$2,250; 1 executive clerk, \$2,000; 2 executive clerks, at \$1,980 each; 1 seed inspector, \$1,000; 1 seed warehouseman, \$1,400; 1 seed warehouseman, \$1,000; 1 seed warehouseman, \$840; 7 clerks, class 4; 12 clerks, class 3; 3 clerks, at \$1,500 each; 23 clerks, class 2; 58 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk or draftsman, \$1,200; 1 clerk, \$1,080; 7 clerks, at \$1,020 each; 25 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 44 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 clerk or draftsman, \$900; 11 clerks, at \$840 each; 1 laborer, \$780; 41 messengers or laborers, at \$720 each; 11 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$600 each; 30 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$600 each; 1 artist, \$1,620; 1 clerk or artist, \$1,400; 2 clerks or artists, at \$1,200 each; 1 photographer, \$1,200; 1 photographer, \$840; 2 laboratory aids, at \$1,440 each; 1 laboratory aid, \$1,380; 4 laboratory aids or clerks, at \$1,200 each; 1 laboratory aid, clerk, or skilled laborer, \$1,080; 3 laboratory aids, clerks, or skilled laborers, at \$1,020 each; 2 laboratory aids, at \$960 each; 1 laboratory aid, \$900; 4 laboratory aids, at \$840 each; 7 laboratory aids, at \$720 each; 1 laboratory apprentice, \$720; 1 map tracer, \$600; 2 gardeners, at \$1,440 each; 4 gardeners, at \$1,200 each; 8 gardeners, at \$1,100 each; 15 gardeners, at \$900 each; 19 gardeners, at \$780 each; 1 skilled laborer, \$960; 2 skilled laborers, at \$900 each; 3 skilled laborers, at \$840 each; 1 assistant in technology, \$1,400; 1 assistant in technology, \$1,380; 1 mechanician, \$1,080; 1 mechanical assistant, \$1,200; 1 blacksmith, \$900; 1 carpenter, \$900; 1 painter, \$900; 1 teamster, \$840; 1 teamster, \$600; 21 laborers, at \$540 each; 35 laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at \$480 each; 4 laborers or charwomen, at \$480 each; 5 laborers or messenger boys, at \$420 each; 20 charwomen, at \$240 each; 16 messenger boys, at \$360 each; in all, \$440,020.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 1, after the word "laborers," insert a comma.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In line 7, on page 17, I notice a provision for one executive clerk. Is not that a change in the title?

Mr. LEVER. This one executive clerk was carried on the statutory roll heretofore as one superintendent of seed weighing and mailing. The department recommended a change in the title of that clerk in order to give a little more elasticity in appointment.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman know whether that was by way of hint or intimation that perhaps the congressional seed distribution should be dispensed with—

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. WALSH. And hence there would be no need for a superintendent?

Mr. LEVER. No; I am afraid not.



The Clerk read as follows:

For conducting such investigations of the nature and means of communication of the disease of citrus trees, known as citrus canker, and by applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary, including the payment of such expenses and the employment of such persons and means, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and cooperation with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations of growers, or individuals, as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, \$250,000, and, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, no expenditures shall be made for these purposes until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by State, county, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of such purposes: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the chairman of the committee state what kind of plants or tree growth this money is applied to for the eradication of citrus canker?

Mr. LEVER. The citrus canker is a fungus disease which attacks citrus trees, orange, grapefruit, and lemon, and any of the citrus family. We had an outbreak of it first in Florida a couple of years ago. We appropriated quite a considerable sum of money at that time. This year we think we have recommended a sufficient sum. We have practically cleaned up the State of Florida, the testimony shows, and there is only knowledge of one infection in the State. The State of Florida at the meeting of its last legislature appropriated \$300,000 for cooperation with the Federal Government to cover a period of two years. There is, however, danger of the spread of the disease in Louisiana, Alabama, Texas, Mississippi, and the purpose of this appropriation is to insure a complete eradication from the United States of the disease, because it is tremendously infectious and destructive.

Mr. COX. How is that infection carried?

Mr. LEVER. By birds and on the clothing of men. These men who fight this disease clothe themselves in rubber. It is carried by any movable thing.

Mr. WALSH. Can the gentleman state under what item in this bill, if there is an appropriation for the purpose, is carried the provision for destroying currant bushes and other similar shrubs because of their being afflicted with some kind of a fungus growth or disease?

Mr. LEVER. That is carried in the next item, I think. It is the white-pine blister rust that the gentleman has in mind, is it not?

Mr. WALSH. It is some kind of a growth similar to that.

The Clerk read as follows:

For applying such methods of eradication or control of the white-pine blister rust as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary, including the payment of such expenses and the employment of such persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, in cooperation with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations, or individuals as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, \$230,448, and in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture no expenditures shall be made for these purposes until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by State, county, or local authorities or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of such purposes: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. As I understand the phraseology of this paragraph, no part of the money appropriated can be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed. Is the discretion vested in the Secretary of Agriculture under this paragraph such that it goes to the extent where he may limit the use to which the money contributed by local authorities is put, so that no part of that money can be used for the payment of property destroyed?

Mr. LEVER. I should not think so. I should not think the Secretary of Agriculture would have any control over funds other than those appropriated by Congress itself.

Mr. WALSH. But he can restrict the use of the Federal appropriation until the money is appropriated by the States.

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that in many localities where this disease has broken out the Federal authorities have either directly, or, acting through the department, pulled up and destroyed large numbers of afflicted shrubs, and that the people who own them have not been able to receive any compensation therefor.

Mr. LEVER. The same principle applies in this item as applies in the citrus-canker item which we discussed a moment ago.

Mr. WALSH. That is what I wanted to ask, whether the citrus-canker sufferers, the owners of property who had trees afflicted, have been able to receive compensation from the State or local authorities for their trees which have been destroyed?

Mr. LEVER. I do not think so. I know they have not received any compensation from the Federal Government. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DRANE] can give that information, I think.

Mr. DRANE. If the gentleman will allow me, I will give him the information. The citrus canker grows in the State of Florida. When they find the citrus canker has attacked a tree they give that tree up as lost. They generally, on their own volition, destroy it and they make no claim.

Mr. WALSH. And the same reasoning follows as to this item?

Mr. LEVER. Exactly.

Mr. WALSH. If any of the stock has been attacked, it is of benefit to the community to have that property destroyed and the disease stamped out in that way?

Mr. LEVER. That is the idea, exactly.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I would state to the chairman and the committee that I think this policy that has been inaugurated in regard to cooperation with the Federal Government by the local authorities is wise, and ought, in so far as it is possible, to become the policy of all the gratuities of the Federal Government, because there is a feeling that here and there somebody will come in and ask the Federal Government for assistance without any regard as to how much of the burden should be borne by themselves, and I believe that complaint has some foundation.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit, I will say to him I thoroughly agree with him, and I think one of the most interesting legislative developments in recent years has been the adoption of this policy to which the gentleman refers; for instance, the agricultural extension act, the Federal road act, the citrus canker, the white-pine blister rust, and other items in this bill.

Mr. FESS. Is there any hope that that may become the fixed policy of Government gratuities in the future?

Mr. LEVER. It seems to me we are tending rapidly in that direction.

Mr. FESS. I think it is a very wise position for the Government to take.

Mr. LEVER. I think so myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to correct a typographical error.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 3, after the word "authorities," to insert a comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the item on page 19, line 19.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to return to the page and line indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, let the amendment be reported.

Mr. LEVER. Just to correct a typographical error.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 19, after the word "and" strike out the word "by" and insert in lieu thereof the word "for."

Mr. LEVER. It is the item of last year's act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For acclimatization and adaptation investigations of cotton, corn, and other crops introduced from tropical regions, and for the improvement of cotton and other fiber plants by cultural methods, breeding, and selection, and for determining the feasibility of increasing the production of hard fibers outside of the continental United States, \$85,510: *Provided*, That not less than \$7,500 of this sum shall be used for experiments in cottonseed interbreeding: *Provided further*, That of this amount \$3,000 may be used for experiments in the production of New Zealand flax in the United States and for its utilization in the manufacture of binder twine.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the item just read. I wish to inquire what is contemplated by this new phraseology as to experimentation in the production of New Zealand flax in the United States?

Mr. LEVER. I will ask the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] to give the gentleman the information.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, it is claimed that New Zealand flax will produce a very much cheaper binder twine. The binder-twine problem has become more and more serious every year. New Zealand flax grows in southern California now as an ornamental plant, and also in Florida, and I presume will grow in different places throughout the South.



It was introduced there because it is a beautiful plant, growing about 8 feet tall. That is how it happens to be in the United States at this time in very limited quantities. In New Zealand they have made more or less binder twine from it and they export some to Australia. It is claimed that they have now in California a new process by which this plant can be manufactured into twine very cheaply and secure a much cheaper product than can now be obtained. As the gentleman knows, we are now dependent upon other countries for the supply of binder twine. That is not a good condition, especially in this time of war, when we ought not to be dependent upon other countries for the twine to bind our grain. The product comes from Mexico and the Philippines. We do not know how long the latter may be a part of the United States.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman to ask a question of the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. What is the character of the product? Is it a firm, strong twine?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; I will say to the gentleman it must have been, or the International Harvester Co. would not have already placed a big order with the people in California if they can produce it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the item on page 23 we find an appropriation of \$240,000, \$50,000 more than carried in last year's bill, providing, among other things, for the investigation of the cultivation and breeding of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax diseases. I wish to inquire whether that last phraseology would not permit the utilization of this large amount of a quarter of a million dollars for the very purpose of which the gentleman now speaks.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I would say not, for this reason: While this is called flax, I do not know any reason on earth why we should call it that. It does not belong to the flax family. That is to say, it has no seed which can be sold to make anything. They utilize only the stalk. It is a sisal, that is what it is, pure and simple.

Mr. STAFFORD. If my memory is not at fault, there was carried in times past an item for some agricultural experimentation in North Dakota or near by for flax development, and I take it that amount was provided out of this general appropriation.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think that is a different character of experiment.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman coming from that region and being acquainted with flax culture, both animal and vegetable, I wish to inquire how much has been expended along those lines of experimentation in the gentleman's State?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think that was in respect to utilizing the flax straw. Of course we raise flax in North Dakota. It is the greatest flax State in the Union. We raise it for the seed. We usually do not count the straw as being worth anything, or at least it has not been utilized up to this time. There have been small sums with which to experiment with the flax straw, to see if it could be utilized for binder twine. Up to this time we have not found a method to prepare it so it makes a serviceable binder twine.

Mr. STAFFORD. How much has been expended for that purpose out of the National Treasury?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think about \$10,000 a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. And the experiments are still going on?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. They are.

Mr. STAFFORD. Once a thing is started under national auspices it never stops, unless objection is raised to it and it is singled out so that a point of order can be raised against it. In this bill there is no opportunity for any Member to spot it; otherwise it might receive a knock-out blow. Now, I am inquiring what better results may be expected if we launch upon this new variety of flax development with this New Zealand variety? Do you think we will have 10 years of experimentation, at an annual expenditure of \$10,000, and come no nearer than we are to-day in the other flax development?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think we will have to trust in this case to the department. It may be that money is spent that ought not to be spent, but we can not in this House vote the money and then ourselves spend it. We have got to trust to an executive to spend the money after we vote it.

Mr. STAFFORD. But we can all rely on the Members who come from those States where those expenditures were originally instituted, when they realize the experiment is a failure, to strike it out.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I will say that while we asked for this appropriation of \$3,000 to experiment with New Zealand flax it will not grow in North Dakota or in any of the Northern States. It does grow in southern California and some other portions of the South.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give the assurance to this extent, that the amount appropriated herein, if it is allowed now, will not grow in amount?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am satisfied there is no need for it to ever grow in amount.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, upon that assurance I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I only desire at this time to call the attention of the committee to the immense importance of the development, if we possibly can, in the United States or in our possessions, of some sort of a fiber plant that will supply our farmers with the necessary material to make our own binding twine. The condition now is most unfortunate. Practically all of the supply that is required for the making of binding twine in the United States comes from Mexico. Now, we are paying because of the fact that it is controlled by a Government monopoly, or our farmers are required to pay, three or four times the price which under normal conditions and under competition, and as conditions existed before, was required to be paid. We are in the clutches of a Mexican monopoly, and it is a serious proposition, because, without binding twine, it is impossible for the farmers of the United States to gather their grain crops.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I will.

Mr. WALSH. Is not the increased cost of binding twine carried on to the price which the farmer receives for his grain?

Mr. TOWNER. I think not. I think that that is comparatively inconsiderable. In fact, the farmer does not receive the price for his grain at any time based upon the cost of the production of grain. The gentleman could easily ascertain that fact if he would make a study of prices. The matters that determine the price of grain are entirely extraneous as far as the cost of production is concerned. The cost of production for one year must be just as great as for another year, and yet the price may be twice as much in one year as it is in another year.

Now, we are conducting in the Philippine Islands experiments, aided partially by our own Department of Agriculture, but not to the extent I would like to see it done, in the development there of the fiber plant which can produce, it is thought, a quality of sisal that will be almost, if not quite, equal to that which is produced in Mexico for binding-twine purposes. It may be that we will be able to develop, and I hope we may, in the Philippine Islands a plant that will take the place of the Mexican sisal. I hope, but hardly expect, that we will be able in our climate, in a temperate zone, to produce the necessary plant growth that will give us the fiber necessary for the production of the best sort of binding twine. However, I think that these experiments ought to be carried on, not only for binding-twine purposes but for the many purposes for which these fiber plants may be used. We are using fiber plants in the production of bagging for grain and for vegetables. We are using fiber plants in a hundred different methods and manners, and all of this can be utilized. Certainly the Department of Agriculture is acting wisely in doing all that it can for this development. I hope the appropriations that are to be given in aid of the experiments carried on in Dakota will be granted ungrudgingly. I hope that wherever it is possible for us, recognizing the almost supreme importance and necessity of furnishing to the farmers of the United States who are growing our grain this absolutely essential requisite for the harvesting of their crops, Congress will do all it possibly can to encourage this growth and development. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman understand that these experiments are to be carried on in North Dakota?

Mr. TOWNER. Not all of them.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from North Dakota one or two questions for information.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Very well.



Mr. FESS. What proportion of the binding twine that we use do we import? Can the gentleman make a general statement?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. My colleague from Iowa says 90 per cent. I think that is a fair estimate. It is practically all brought in either from Mexico or the Philippine Islands. Mexico is now a foreign country, and the Philippines may be if the majority in Congress has its way.

Mr. FESS. We have in the district that I have the honor to represent a very large binding-twine manufactory, and they seem to be wholly dependent upon the product that comes from Mexico and Central America, especially Central America.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. And so are the farmers. It would be a greater calamity for the farmers to have that supply cut off in time of war than it would be for your manufacturing plants.

Mr. FESS. The manufacturing plant, of course, produces it for the farmer. The raw material coming from that section—I have had a good deal of correspondence as to priority shipments in the past few months, stating that that market was pretty nearly closed. I was wondering whether there was any hope of developing a substitute for the sisal that we receive from South and Central America and Mexico. Do you hope to do that through the New Zealand flax?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is the hope, because this plant grows very profusely and will produce ten times as much per acre as any other sisal.

Mr. FESS. One reason why I arose was the emphasis placed upon this article as a necessity at this time—that it might be regarded as an essential article rather than a nonessential article. I should think it would be, because it is absolutely necessary for the harvesting of our crops.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. They have never found anything satisfactory to use in harvesters except twine such as they have now. If you take wire, it gets into the thrashing machine and tears it to pieces.

Mr. FESS. They want to avoid that?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. You have got to have a strong twine, but one which can be easily cut.

Mr. FESS. Where will these experiments be made?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Naturally, where the plants are growing now—in the Imperial Valley of southern California.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] said, it is of the highest importance to develop in this country a plant to take the place of the sisal that we are now importing for use in the manufacture of binding twine for the wheat-growing sections of the country. By this appropriation it is proposed that experiments are to be made with this New Zealand flax, to ascertain whether it can be used as a substitute for sisal. The officials of the Department of Agriculture, as will appear in the hearings under the Bureau of Plant Industry items on page 39, are not very sanguine about the prospects of being able to use the fiber of this plant as a substitute for sisal or for other fiber now used in the manufacture of binding twine. This plant, phormium tenax, or the so-called New Zealand flax, is not like the ordinary flax plant at all. In fact, it does not belong to the same family. It belongs to the lily family, and in general appearance and manner of growth it resembles the iris, or blue flag, except that the leaves are much longer, attaining a length of 5 to 8 feet. It grows wild in New Zealand. Extensive experiments have been made in its use there. The fiber from this plant is now being used in this country and in New Zealand to a small extent in the manufacture of inferior grades of rope and twine. The method of cleaning and preparing phormium fiber is very laborious and expensive. There has been a standing offer of \$60,000 in New Zealand for 20 years for the discovery or invention of improved methods for preparing this fiber, but no one has claimed the offer.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman has covered the point I was going to ask, as to what experiments were made in New Zealand. Were they for the purpose of ascertaining the methods and machinery necessary to be used in converting it into twine?

Mr. NORTON. Yes; I should expect that that would be about the only thing that this appropriation could be used for, to determine the best method of preparing this fiber and to determine the uses which may be made of the fiber in this country, I do not think there is any question about its growth. It will grow in any warm, moist climate.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Yes; I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Did the experiments made in New Zealand tend to show whether it would be adapted to the same uses that it is used for here? Do you know whether it is used as we would want to use it on the harvesters here?

Mr. NORTON. According to the statement of the department here, it is not suitable to be used alone for the manufacture of binder twine. It can be used to fill in with a stronger fiber.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I will say that the department expects, if this item is allowed, to bring in some seed. The roots were brought in last year, quite a quantity of them—or at least they were headed this way, but on account of the fact that insects were working in the growths they deemed it proper, under the quarantine regulations, to prevent the material coming in. Now it is proposed to bring in the tops with the seed, so as to get a supply to start growing it in southern California.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I understand the Department is not enthusiastic about this proposition. Does not the gentleman think that in view of the fact that our farmers are now compelled to pay an extortionate price by reason of this Government monopoly we could afford to take some chances, even if we were grasping at more straws than one?

Mr. NORTON. Yes. I quite agree with the gentleman. I believe it is highly important that some substitute be found for Yucatan henequen, which has now become so expensive for use in the manufacture of binding twine, owing to the monopoly under which it is sold.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and improvement of cereals and methods of cereal production, and the study of cereal diseases, and for the investigation of the cultivation and breeding of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax diseases, and for the investigation and improvement of broom corn and methods of broom-corn production, \$241,505: *Provided*, That \$40,000 shall be set aside for the study of corn improvement and methods of corn production: *Provided also*, That \$50,000 shall be set aside for the investigation of the diseases of wheat, oats, and barley known as black rust and stripe rust: *Provided also*, That \$25,000 shall be set aside for the investigation of corn root and stalk diseases and for the inauguration of such control measures as may be found necessary.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Page 23, line 14, after the word "investigation," insert "and control."

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation carried for this purpose in the past has been for investigations, and those who have been conducting these investigations have now reached the conclusion that the cause of black rust is the barberry bush; and they have at last reached the conclusion that the money devoted to this purpose should be used chiefly to eradicate or destroy the barberry bush, rather than to investigate this matter any further. So I think it is necessary now to add the words "and control" after the word "investigation." Otherwise the department might be hampered somewhat in spending the money. The exportable surplus of wheat for the allies must come from North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Montana. With the winter wheat reported in bad condition, worse than at any time since crop records were kept, it is the part of prudence to see to it that so far as it is humanly possible nothing shall happen to our wheat crop to be seeded next spring. It would be possible in the four States just mentioned for black rust to destroy enough wheat so that we could not export a single bushel without the people going hungry in the United States. There is no guessing about this. We found out in 1916 what a terrible scourge black rust could be, and the enemy has been found. The barberry bush stands indicted by the scientists of this and several other countries.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. COX. I am very much interested in this item. If it is doing any good, I would like to see it doubled, trebled, and quadrupled, because of all things that our farmers have had to deal with this black rust is the most destructive. It wipes us off the map every year or two and cleans us out. Has the department located the primary and proximate cause of this rust; and if so, what has it finally settled upon?



Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. There were 37 plant experts who met in Madison last year, and they were unanimous in their finding that the barberry bush, which is an ornamental shrub growing chiefly in the towns and villages, is the cause of black rust.

Mr. COX. Is there more than one variety of that bush?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. There are quite a number of varieties, and all except the Japanese barberry bush are hosts for the parasites that are driven by the wind to the wheat fields and cause black rust.

Mr. COX. How does the gentleman account for the fact that you will find this black rust away out in the country, clear away from any shrubbery at all?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The reason is this: When the parasite breaks away from the barberry bush it is in the form of a very fine powder, lighter than air, and when it is taken up by the winds it is carried hundreds of miles. These particles are so fine that one bush thrown out into the wind will scatter them over an immense area of territory, surprisingly large.

Mr. COX. Then, the only remedy to get rid of the black rust is, first, to get rid of the barberry bush. Is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. COX. What kind of a racket are we going to get into with our people in the towns and cities when we undertake to destroy their fine shrubbery?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. It seems to me in this time of war, when some of the people in the cities are glorying over the fact that they have plowed up their tennis courts and planted them to potatoes, we can get enough patriotic people in the United States to understand that one of the best ways to win this war is to dig up these barberry bushes.

Mr. COX. I quite agree with the gentleman; but I want to know what these scientists have further found out.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. In the hard-wheat States, Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota, alone, we lost 180,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1916 from the black rust.

Mr. COX. There is no doubt on earth about that.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That was more than will be saved by this entire wheat-saving campaign being conducted by Mr. Hoover, and you will understand that I do not want to minimize the great conservation work which he is performing.

Mr. COX. The 1915 crop of Indiana was almost wiped off the map, and fields of 20 or 40 acres that looked to be fine wheat one day were not worth a cent the next. Have these scientists discovered anything else, other than this barberry bush, that is responsible for this?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. No; they have not in the Northern States.

Mr. COX. They place the whole responsibility there, and there alone?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; and they point out that they eradicated the barberry bush from Denmark in 1903 and have not had black rust there since.

Mr. COX. That means that you have got to dig up these bushes and burn them?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Dig them up.

Mr. COX. Destroy them in some way?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman say how far this black rust will carry?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. They have found in India that it will carry as far as 300 miles.

Mr. TILSON. I was wondering if it would carry from Connecticut to North Dakota? If so, I had better dig up some that I recently had planted in my yard.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. It will undoubtedly carry from the gentleman's State over into Ohio, where they raise quite a lot of wheat. How much wheat do they raise in Connecticut?

Mr. TILSON. Very little.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. It is up to the people in the States where they do not grow wheat, as well as in the States where they do, to dig up the barberry bush as a matter of patriotism.

Mr. TILSON. If it will destroy wheat, we surely will dig it up.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Thank you; you are a patriot.

Mr. Chairman, I have had a number of important letters upon this subject. C. G. Selvig, superintendent of the agricultural school and station at Crookston, writes to strongly urge a campaign to exterminate the barberry bushes. G. H. Coons, plant pathologist of the Michigan Agricultural College, has written a letter to Representative P. H. KELLEY, of Michigan. He says:

It is difficult for one not familiar with the possibilities of wind transference of fungus spores and not fully aware of the enormous powers of multiplication which these spores possess to realize that this common ornamental shrub which has been planted here and there in the yards and parks is such an enemy to our most important food crop.

Already the farmers of Denmark have met this situation and have eradicated the barberry, with the result that no epidemics of stem rust have occurred in the 10 years since the eradication was accomplished. The farmers in North Dakota have recently passed a law declaring the barberry an outlaw.

Representative Young of North Dakota is attempting to get into the agricultural bill a \$50,000 appropriation to get the bush located, to arouse public sentiment, and to insure that the bush will come out before it can endanger our next year's wheat crop.

May I ask that you confer with Mr. Young and assist him in this worthy conservation measure?

We might think, perhaps, that this was a matter of concern only to the great western wheat States, but in our own Clinton County this last summer rust caused a loss of 15 per cent of the wheat crop.

On one hand is a worthless bush, readily replaced in any landscape gardening scheme—the small Japanese barberry (*Berberis thunbergii*) is not concerned in this—and on the other hand is a valuable crop, which the bush damages.

The facts of the relation of wheat rust to barberry are taught in every high-school botany. Now is the time to make use of our common knowledge.

Prof. H. L. Bolley, of the North Dakota Agricultural College, has given more study to plant diseases than any pathologist in the United States. It was he who discovered a preventive for wheat smut. He is very strong in the conviction that the barberries must all be destroyed; and if eradicated, that black rust will disappear. He writes me as follows:

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE, NORTH DAKOTA,  
January 21, 1918.

Hon. GEORGE M. YOUNG,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

DEAR MR. YOUNG: President Ladd called me into consultation relative to your telegram, and, of course, you know my interest in this work. I want to aid you in every way I can in this effort which you are making.

No doubt you have already talked with Representative JOHN M. BAER, who is quite familiar with our work here and who aided me greatly in the propaganda work previous to the introduction of our State law. I am sure he will aid you there.

I am sending you a card with some barberry leaves showing some of the rust pustules and will confine this note to statements of conditions.

(1) In my telegram you will note that I suggested that you have the law call for an order for the eradication of the barberry as an emergency measure. I hope you will make it clear to everyone that an appropriation of \$50,000 at this time for "further studies as to methods of eradication of wheat rust" would essentially be a waste of public moneys and man power or energy. The thing to do now is to do the thing that all cereal pathologists who have studied the disease in the fields want done, namely, kill the barberry bushes and prevent a further planting of such bushes which bear and start wheat rust. This, all are agreed, will give results and clear the way for further work, if then needed.

There are a good many conservative people in the world and there are a good many fine parks in which this shrub has been used for decorative purposes, and there will be people, and plant pathologists, perhaps, who will advise that there should be further time for survey, further time for study, and further time for the putting on of an "educational campaign," etc. Some of these men are perfectly honest—but, as indicated, the pathologists who have studied cereal crops and who have been in the field are all agreed—see resolution of 37 cereal pathologists assembled at Madison, Wis., in July, 1917, in which they asked President Wilson for action in this matter. The reason that the resolution did not then ask President Wilson to immediately proceed to destroy the bushes as a war emergency measure was not because the pathologists believed it should not be done then but because they wanted to give the Department of Agriculture time to finish the survey that was then being made, and they thought perhaps the President was extremely busy and would like some time before having such an order made. That the people of the wheat States agree in this matter of eradication—see resolution of the Tri-State Grain Growers' Convention in January, 1917, asking for the survey which the department has now made. See also the resolution at the meeting of the Red River Valley Stock and Development Association at Crookston, Minn., and which appointed a committee of three to visit Washington to ask for immediate action in the matter of barberry eradication. This association represents 10 leading wheat counties of Minnesota. See also the resolution by the present Tri-State Grain Growers' Association in which they appointed a committee to go with the Minnesota committee. See also the fact that the Canadian Governments have ordered the eradication of the bush throughout the Canadian Provinces. See also telegrams by Grisdale. I have learned by letters from the chief pathologist of the Michigan Agricultural College that in all probability there will be a delegation from that State which represents mills, bankers, growers, etc.

Showing the Canadian interest in the matter, I have in my possession maps and figures of the agricultural agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway, showing that in 1916 in the Provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan alone there was a loss of over \$100,000,000 from this black-rust scourge.

(2) While North Dakota has eradicated her barberry bushes by law, those who have asked that this be done have asked it as a lesson to other States. They know that the eradication of the bushes in North Dakota alone will not save the wheat crop of North Dakota from barberry bushes that grow in Minnesota and other States south and eastward, for the "wind bloweth where it listeth." Our farmers and public have done this work as a sanitary measure, and ask that the citizens, consumers, and public eastward take an interest in such matters and cause the same to be done there. You will be interested to know that it costs us almost nothing to do the work—the women's clubs, children, and citizens in general digging up the bushes as soon as notified of their presence. They did it freely and gladly when they learned that their hedge was destructive and when they understood that the law acted



equally on all citizens, understanding that a sanitary measure does not get full recognition until there is a law which puts all citizens on an equal basis.

(3) You will note that in my telegram of yesterday I advocated "nation-wide action." You will wonder why the growers' conventions and the plant pathologists have not indicated this nation-wide action, particularly as I and others who advocate the general destruction of the bushes have usually been present. I can only answer that in framing resolutions we try to be sure that the wording will be such that the organization will pass it—understand it. One does not always get the wording he knows to be right.

I have had commendatory letters on this eradication work in North Dakota from far and wide—Canada, New York, Virginia, etc. It has given encouragement to many of our State plant pathologists. They are calling for like work in their State. You will perhaps be told that bushes in Indiana, Tennessee, and other more Southern States and in large eastern cities are not materially effective in spreading this rust. The men in the Department of Agriculture Survey this year did not find southern bushes materially infected south of Iowa at the time they were surveying. True, one may often go in big cities and have difficulty in finding rust on the bushes. These bushes can not have rust on them unless the conditions are right or unless some black-rust spores fall. Some of these bushes are not close to the wheat fields and wild grasses which bear the black-rust spores; some of them are even surrounded by bluegrass lawns. This does not, however, prove that when the proper conditions of infection are present that they will not do the work regardless of what State or what city they are in. Last year I picked an abundance of barberry leaves in large cities of Wisconsin and Minnesota, even in the center of Minneapolis, the leaves of which were infected. I have no doubt but had I visited Detroit, Cleveland, Buffalo, or Rochester I should have found plenty of affected barberry, enough to have destroyed the crops of Michigan and Ontario if the weather conditions were suitable. My own experience in Indiana in 1887 and 1888 records as destructive attacks on barberry bushes at Lafayette, Ind., as I have ever seen in the Northwest—the failure to see birds fly over does not mean that summer has not gone by.

(4) Again let me call your attention to the fact that there is a material difference between a law for the eradication of rust and a law for the eradication of barberry bushes. May we not hope that the wording will be such that the President, the Food Administration Board, or other war board may at once order and call for the eradication of the one criminal rust producer which we all know, namely, the common barberry bush and all its kinds and varieties which bear the rust, and that the wording may be such that it will apply to barberry bushes wherever found? Let the funds provided be used for the proper propaganda and survey to locate the bushes for the people, and they will dig them out whenever asked to do so.

(5) Remember that this eradication measure to be effective in the increase of the crop of 1918 should commence at once, before the leaves of the barberry are formed in the spring. Spores begin to form on the bushes as soon as the first leaves are fairly well formed; at least, as early as May 10 to 20 in latitudes of Chicago and southward; June 1 to July northward.

Yours, respectfully,

H. L. BOLLEY.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield me three minutes?

Mr. HAUGEN. I would like five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania desires three minutes and my colleague on the committee, the ranking member on that side, Mr. HAUGEN, desires five minutes. So, Mr. Chairman, I will make it 23 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 23 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the addition of the words "and control," as suggested by the gentleman from North Dakota, means that the department is to use this money for the purpose of removing these bushes that they are talking about, I think the amendment ought not to be adopted. I have no objection to the use of money by the department for making investigations or for learning the best methods of control, but before the department goes into the business of controlling it by hiring a large number of men to do nothing but cut these barberry bushes, I am opposed to it.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. There are a great many ways in which the department can use this money, and I think the gentleman will understand from what we were told in the committee that it would be used chiefly in an educational campaign. That was the statement made to us by Dr. Kellerman. I will say also that they propose to control the matter through the control of interstate shipments under the quarantine law. That is one of the kinds of control they ought to exercise now.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. We found some years ago, when several hundred thousand dollars were appropriated for the purpose of combatting the ravages of the gypsy and brown-tail moth, that the scientific Bureau of Entomology, a highly scientific bureau, was at times employing as high as 500 men to do nothing but cut brush. There is a pink boll cotton worm which has made its appearance in Texas, and this Bureau of Entomology says that they have imported into that region as high as 2,000 men to cut and pull up cotton. It seems to me that this is altogether out of place in the Bureau of Entomology or any department of the Government. I would favor any kind of an appropriation to make investigation to discover the

source or cause of diseases affecting agricultural crops and to learn methods of applying the remedies, but when immense sums of money are used for the employment of the physical labor to put into operation the plan that the department has worked out, I think the department is going too far.

Now, if the insertion of this word "control" means that the department is going to employ a lot of men to go through the country to cut down barberry bushes wherever they are found, I think that is an improper use of money. This amendment, if that is the meaning of it, ought not to be adopted.

In many of the activities of this department we find that, where it is authorized by Congress, money is furnished for the purpose of studying diseases, finding remedies, and the best way of applying them, it has gone on and employed a large number of men to do the physical work. I think this Government has gone far enough in making investigation, learning the cause of the trouble, the manner of preventing its return, and the method of control. I cite these instances of the use of money in the employment of 500 men to cut brush in Massachusetts to prevent the spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths and the employment of 2,000 men to pull up cotton as misuse of money. We ought not to permit it in another case relating to wheat and barberry bushes.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will.

Mr. WALSH. Is not this just as important as the eradication of the citrus canker or the white-pine blister, and might it not be safeguarded with the same kind of a proviso and handled in the same way? They appropriate there for the eradication and control, and if this destroys the entire wheat crop, it seems as though appropriations of this sort would be justified if we could safeguard them.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I take the same position with reference to the wheat crop as to the park trees in Massachusetts and the cotton crop, and all these things. I think it is the duty of the Federal Government to ascertain the cause, work out a plan or remedy, but not to employ an immense number of men to do physical labor.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota at this time, because I think it would lead to interminable trouble. Barberry bushes have not been sufficiently exploited in the House to justify our taking such summary action in regard to them. The gentleman from New York sitting by my side has just invested \$25 in barberry bushes and others are buying them and have been doing so for years. The bush is used for ornamental purposes throughout the land, and has been sent out by Members of Congress in their Washington allotments. Apparently the Department of Agriculture is primarily responsible for the distribution of the barberry bush.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman appears not to have heard the splendid address on this subject the other day by my colleague from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I heard the gentleman from North Dakota to-day. He said if we would win the war we must get rid of the barberry bush. In this my genial friend from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] goes Hoover one better.

Mr. NORTON. If the gentleman was shown that the barberry bush was responsible for the black rust in wheat and other cereal crops and we had no means of destroying the black rust except by the eradication of the barberry bush, would he not then favor the eradication of the barberry bush?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Under these circumstances "the gentleman from Pennsylvania" would favor the eradication of the barberry bush in North Dakota, but he would not favor going into the front yard or the back yard of every person who had a comfortable little home in Pennsylvania and New Jersey to prevent the flight through the air all the way to North Dakota of these little atoms described by the gentleman from North Dakota, who states that 300 miles is the extent of the flight.

Mr. NORTON. I will say to the gentleman that scientists have made a careful study of this question. It is not at all a new one. The black-rust problem has been encountered in Europe for many years. There it has been found that it can be controlled by the eradication of the barberry bush.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We have no official information of that fact in the House.

Mr. NORTON. You have if you have read the hearings before the Agricultural Committee. It is not a new question at all. These scientists have unanimously declared to the world that the native barberry bush is one of the hosts in the life cycle of the germs of black rust. It has been thoroughly demonstrated that through the eradication of the native barberry bush the spread of black rust can be controlled.



Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We have the word of two gentlemen from North Dakota that the cause of the black rust which destroys the wheat crop in North Dakota is the barberry bush that grows in front of residences in New Jersey and elsewhere throughout the United States.

But there is a reason for doubting the propriety of this amendment. I am not willing that the gentlemen from North Dakota shall indulge in the happy practice, which is characteristic of the other side, of appointing 500 inspectors from North Dakota and elsewhere to go into the front yards of the people who happen to reside along the Atlantic seaboard and dig up their barberry bushes. I can not quite see the connection between the barberry bushes that thrive on the salt air of the Atlantic coast and the wheat crop of North Dakota which is destroyed by the black rust. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young], who is unquestionably as great a scientific expert upon this question as is the other gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Norron], admits in his scientific analysis of the situation that this microbe, or whatever it may be, that emanates from the barberry bush does not float more than three or four hundred miles at the most, and there is considerably more distance than that between the barberry bushes that ornament the residences of people in New Jersey or New York and the wheat fields of North Dakota.

I do not like the idea of appointing 500 inspectors for this work, as suggested by the gentleman from Michigan, first, because it would be a heavy charge upon the Government. Then, again, these gentlemen who would naturally tour the country—very capable gentlemen and good talkers all of them—might, in their patriotic enthusiasm, forget the influence of the barberry bush in "winning the war" to say a few kind words about the administration and the necessity of "upholding the hands of the President." With expenses paid, they might be tempted to forget the barberry bush.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman in his discussion is winning votes for the amendment on this side of the House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman sees the point. It seems to me, if these 500 men are to go about lecturing on the barberry bush, telling us to dig it up and destroy our hedges to "win the war," it might have a serious effect upon the approaching campaign.

Mr. LOBECK. The gentleman is in favor of winning the war, is he not?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, yes; winning it by strength of arms, by vigorous action. I question whether the elimination of the barberry bush is going to have the effect which the gentleman from Nebraska and I desire.

Mr. LOBECK. Would it not be helpful, according to the gentleman's statement?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This is the first time we have heard of the evil effects of the barberry bush upon the Nation, and the world at war. A while ago we heard about the advisability of using horse meat to "win the war." Now we are told that the barberry bush is stopping our progress. I trust the administration will overcome these difficulties and that notwithstanding the ravages of the barberry bush we may go ahead and win the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, let me reassure my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] as to the prospect of any inspector digging up barberry bushes in the yards of gentlemen coming from New York or New Jersey. Nothing we can do in connection with the paragraph could possibly give the inspectors power to race over the doorway of the gentleman from New York, even if he was so unpatriotic as to refuse to dig up the barberry bush after he had been convinced that it is the cause of the black rust. It is true that the words suggested to be inserted by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young] may empower inspectors who are given consent by owners to go and dig some barberry bush, but we ought not to lose sleep over that. What we want is to get the barberry bush eradicated all over the country, because there are wheat fields near New York and near New Jersey, in all of the States, or practically all of them, and these scientists having agreed that this is the cause of the black rust, I am sure that everybody in the United States will be patriotic enough to dig up his bushes himself.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. Is not the best method—and, in fact, the only practical method—of controlling this, through the prevention of interstate shipment of barberry bushes?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I intended to mention that, but I did not have time enough; but the main object, as I understand the gentleman from North Dakota, is to prevent interstate shipment of barberry bushes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the scientists are generally agreed that the only way to eradicate the black rust is by eradicating the barberry bush. As has been stated here, the barberry bush is the host of the fungus—the plant in its first stage. It develops in the barberry bush. In the second stage it has for its host the various grains and grasses. Anybody who knows anything about black rust knows about its ravages; and it is a safe estimate to say that the black rust for the last 25 years, at least, has decreased the wheat yield at least 25 per cent, and it is safe to say that if black rust can be eradicated the yield of wheat—not only wheat, but oats and other grains as well—could be increased at least 25 per cent. Our allies are asking for 800,000,000 bushels of grain. We have not got them, and they can not fight without food. We must provide them with food if we are going to win the war. We can afford to make this small appropriation, and we can afford to agree to the language that is proposed. I believe that it will bring good results. It has brought good results in other countries. Denmark has tried it out, and there black rust has been eradicated and the yield of wheat has been largely increased. I believe that it is well worth the experiment and the appropriation suggested.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a separate amendment to offer, which has nothing to do with this discussion. I would like to offer the amendment after we get through with this discussion.

Mr. LEVER. I suggest that the gentleman offer it in his own time now, have it considered pending, and discuss it.

Mr. MORGAN. Very well, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 11, strike out "\$241,505" and insert "\$250,000."

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, in offering the amendment to increase this general appropriation for all these items I do not, of course, reflect upon the committee. I know the great attention the gentleman have given to all the paragraphs and all the items of this bill, yet this is a very important paragraph. It relates in general to cereals, wheat, corn, and so forth, and includes broom corn. I happen to represent a district which is very largely a wheat-producing district, and one portion of it is a very large broom-corn producing district. A few years ago Oklahoma produced more than 50 per cent of all the broom corn produced in the United States. There are four counties in my district in which there is a large amount of broom corn produced. I think the United States Government should give encouragement to this industry. Broom corn this year is a good price. Some years it is so low in price that our farmers do not get pay for raising it. The broom-corn growers should have a good price and it should be uniform in price from year to year. The eighth congressional district of Oklahoma is a great agricultural district, composed of 12 of the best agricultural counties in the United States. [Applause.] It is a district composed of the most intelligent farmers in the United States. In its educational facilities—of common schools, of city schools, of colleges and universities—the district is not surpassed in the United States. [Applause.] That is saying a good deal in view of the fact that only about 20 years ago the first settlements were established in the district.

It is a wheat-producing district. We can not, as a Government, give too much attention to increasing the production of wheat. As has been said here in the discussion which has just taken place, whether we and our allies shall be victorious in this great war in a large measure depends upon the production of wheat. Through our Food Control Administration, we are to eat bread composed of only 75 per cent of wheat, but, my friends, what is true in time of war in a few years may be true in time of peace. With the increase of population in this country and throughout the world, the time soon will come, if we do not increase our production of wheat, when there will not be sufficient wheat to supply our population with wheat bread. The National Government should do everything possible to encourage the production of wheat. I am in favor of enlarging this appropriation to the amount which I have suggested in my amendment.

It should be the policy of the National Government to encourage the farmers to enlarge the area cultivated in wheat, to increase the yield per acre, and to maintain a remunerative price for wheat. After all, we can not expect an increased production of wheat unless wheat raising is a profitable business. Low-priced wheat simply means less wheat.



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota) there were—ayes 18, yeas none.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment which I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 15, after the last word, insert "which sum shall be immediately available."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. LEVER. The time has been closed, but I ask that the time be extended for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the chairman of this committee to the fact that unless the barberry bushes are destroyed before May 15 it will not do any good to destroy them this year.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit, the gentleman has discussed this matter with me, and I fully recognize his position, and I have no objection to making it immediately available, because if we are going to use it at all we ought to use it when it is effective. Unless some of my colleagues object I shall have no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is this going to be used for the purpose of engaging a lot of men to go out and dig up these bushes?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I do not believe a single man will be employed that way. As far as I am concerned, I do not want to make promises. I think it is a matter of sufficient importance, and the gentleman from Michigan surely ought not to ask me to make pledges in reference to this. I will say this, that I talked with Dr. Kellerman, who is largely in charge of this matter, and he assured me the use they contemplated to make of this money was this, that they would make a campaign of education and they would use the money in that way; that they expected to make it very comprehensive, and through the county agents, the schools, the colleges, the farm journals, the trade journals, the milling-trade journals, and in every way possible to educate the people on patriotic grounds this year to dig up their barberry bushes.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield to me a moment? Let me say, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Michigan, that if the department should undertake to use this money for the purpose of absolute eradication, the physical destruction of the barberry plant, I think, in view of their statement before the committee, it would be a breach of faith to the committee, and I think it would be a breach of faith with Congress. I do not believe the House intended any such kind of work, and I felt I ought to make that statement.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do not recall any statement before the committee as to just how they would use this money or that would preclude them doing the very thing I object to.

Mr. LEVER. The theory, as expressed before the committee, was that it was to be used for educational purposes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does that mean that they would have the power to go into the States and visit private property and gather and eradicate these bushes?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is too good a lawyer to believe that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming makes the same request. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the item to which I offered an amendment earlier in the day—the tuberculosis matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in respect to the item to which he refers. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and improvement of tobacco and the methods of tobacco production and handling, \$32,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the item. It seems to me that, in view of the action of this House, in response, undoubtedly, to the preponderance of sentiment in various sections of the country as expressed in many different ways in favor of regulating the personal habits of people within our borders, there is no good reason at this time to expend \$32,000 for investigating and improving a noxious weed which is used in large quantities in this Nation; and if we should now refuse to appropriate this \$32,000 and thereby put a stop to improving this weed or improving the method of its production and handling, we would anticipate in large measure a demand which, sooner or later, is going to reach the Representatives of the people in the Congress to prohibit the use of tobacco for smoking or chewing by the people, both in their homes and in public places. And I think the time has come, and here is an opportunity for the Congress to lead the movement and to show the way, and that if we should adopt the amendment, which I offer in all seriousness, we would be taking a step of much benefit and advantage to the American people.

Mr. LOBECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I prefer not to yield just at present, because I have a few more observations to make, and I know that the searching questions of the learned gentleman from Nebraska would put me entirely off my track in presenting to the House these observations.

It seems to me, as I have stated, that here is an opportunity for Congress to anticipate the wishes of the people and to lead the way, to sound the alarm, to set the pace, to blaze the path, and to arouse the sentiment of the country to the dire results that follow the profligate expenditure of many hundreds of thousands of dollars yearly for advertising the various brands of this weed and in purchasing the tobacco that is grown and improved by Federal experts and consuming it simply as the result of a habit. If we can save \$32,000 by eliminating this item, in a few years from now, because we do not investigate and improve tobacco, we can enable the people to save many hundreds of thousands of dollars. We will be following in the wake of the legislation enacted by this Congress in connection with the food-control bill, wherein we vested wide discretion in the President to prohibit the manufacture of alcoholic and intoxicating liquors, which discretion, in my opinion, has been most wisely used by him. And also we will follow in the wake of the action of both branches of this Congress in submitting to the legislatures of the various States the constitutional prohibition amendment. We will be paving the way, in my opinion, whereby instead of appropriating money for investigation and improvement of tobacco and methods of tobacco production we will in the future be appropriating money for the investigation and eradication of tobacco and the discontinuance of tobacco production and handling, and in that way, by legislative enactment and without the necessity of constitutional amendment, we will do much to eliminate another habit which is growing and causing the expenditures of vast sums of money by our people. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. WALSH. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 18, yeas 22.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For testing and breeding fibrous plants, including the testing of flax straw and hemp, in cooperation with the North Dakota Agricultural College, which may be used for paper making, \$16,760.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this paragraph might be amended, so far as the language itself is concerned, by bringing the words "which may be used for



paper making" up to follow the word "hemp," on line 22. But I leave that to the chairman of the committee.

However, I desire to inquire about this item, which carries an appropriation of \$16,760, and which seems to contemplate the testing and breeding of fibrous plants and the testing of flax straw and hemp by the Government in cooperation with the North Dakota Agricultural College. This item has been carried at varying amounts for several years, and it would seem to cover a proposition about which we ought to have some definite information by this time. The committee does not want to duplicate its appropriations or waste public money, I am sure. But on page 22 and on page 23 provision is made for studying and testing commercial seeds, being much the same proposition, to the extent of \$36,680, and \$241,505.

Now, it would seem that some one ought to explain whether anything is actually being accomplished through these appropriations or through this appropriation to the North Dakota Agricultural College.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit, I asked Dr. Kellerman, associate chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry under this item, as to the progress that has been made. I will read from that gentleman's testimony. He says:

Dr. KELLERMAN. The work is progressing favorably, although somewhat slowly. It appears that there is an opportunity for developing a very good grade of paper from flax straw, especially for such purposes as making counters in shoes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. "Counters in shoes"?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; "counters in shoes." I read further:

This is being thoroughly tested out, and the practicability of straw assembling and utilization for paper making is now under way.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long has that testing out been going on?

Dr. KELLERMAN. It was begun in a small way several years ago; I think that work has been going on approximately five years.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long will it take you to complete the work and eliminate this appropriation?

Dr. KELLERMAN. Probably one or two years, I think. We had contemplated greatly reducing this work about this time, but delays in getting satisfactory tests of the papers that might be manufactured made it seem desirable to continue it. We were not considering the complete closing of the project, but we were planning to reduce our work.

Mr. THOMPSON. This will not be a continuing appropriation, then?

Dr. KELLERMAN. This is not likely to be continuing much longer.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one minute right there?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have little time, but I would like to get the information. I would like to know why we are testing and breeding all these years and not getting results.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the gentleman that I believe in my district there is the first commercial concern using straw as a basis in making news-print paper, and that paper is now being used by some of the newspapers in my district. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is progress. Will the gentleman tell me who is employed to do this testing and how the money is expended?

Mr. ANDERSON. I can not answer that question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is the purpose of my question. Here we have two appropriations, one for \$241,505, which puts at work a number of Government specialists, and another appropriation of \$36,680, which puts some other Government experts at work; and then comes a specific appropriation for testing and breeding on the same line, in conjunction with the North Dakota Agricultural College, for which we appropriate \$16,760, and for which we have been making an appropriation right along. The purpose of it seems to be to "test" these fibers. It has been going on for years.

Mr. LEVER. It goes further than actual testing. I understand they have made a great many investigations under this item as to growing hemp for fiber purposes. I can give the gentleman the exact expenditures under this item.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman tell how many men are employed by the Government in connection with the North Dakota Agricultural College for testing and breeding?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. NORTON rose.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this item and amendments thereto close in eight minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this item and amendments thereto close in eight minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object—and only for the purpose of asking the question—will the gentleman cover the point I made?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request, that debate close on this item and all amendments thereto in eight minutes, five minutes to go to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] and three to the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. This appropriation of \$16,660 is proposed to be expended as follows: For salary of paper-plant chemist, \$2,250; one assistant, \$1,320; one assistant physicist, \$1,200; traveling expenses, \$2,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Two thousand dollars for mileage—traveling expenses?

Mr. LEVER. Two thousand dollars for traveling expenses; equipment and material, \$3,950; miscellaneous items, \$5,710.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How long has this been going on?

Mr. LEVER. Dr. Kellerman in his statement says several years.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. He says several years. Gentlemen about me say it has been going on for five or six years.

Mr. LEVER. My knowledge is that it has been going on probably more than six years.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman think an expenditure of \$2,000 for mileage out of an appropriation of \$16,760 is rather high?

Mr. LEVER. I confess that it does look rather high, although I did not make any investigation to find out how they used it and what traveling they did.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did the committee make inquiries about a view to bringing these tests to an end?

Mr. LEVER. In the hearing the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMPSON] repeatedly asked how long this was to continue, and the answer of Dr. Kellerman was from one to two years longer.

Now I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON].

Mr. NORTON. This item has been carried in the bill for six or seven years. It was first carried for \$10,000. Two years ago I made some extended inquiries in regard to the work that was being done under the appropriation. I found that the North Dakota Agricultural College up to that time had been attempting by scientific study and experiments to ascertain whether or not paper could be manufactured from flax on a profitable commercial basis. It was found that in the laboratory there was no great difficulty in manufacturing paper of a very superior quality from flax straw. No method, however, was found for the manufacture of paper from flax straw or from wheat straw which was considered a paying commercial proposition. The methods necessary to be employed in the manufacture of paper from flax straw and from wheat straw were said to be too expensive for practical commercial purposes. I know nothing of the investigations that have been carried on in the last two years. I have been very much surprised to find that \$2,000 is expected to be expended out of this item next year for traveling expenses. It seems to me that the agricultural college is falling into the error that a great many of the Government departments fall into, in using money in a very free-handed way and not directly for the purpose for which it has been appropriated. There is a splendid field for investigation along this line if it is properly carried on. It would mean many hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Northwest if a commercially practicable method could be discovered for the manufacture of paper out of flax straw or wheat straw.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] stated a moment ago that they were manufacturing this paper in a commercial way in his district, and are now using it. Why do not these fellows use some of this traveling-expense money to go out there and see how these people are manufacturing this paper, and work a little along that line for a month or two, and then quit asking Congress for traveling expenses?

Mr. NORTON. Let me say to the gentleman from Kansas that I hope that the industry that has been developed in the district of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] has come in large part through the investigations and experiments with flax straw and wheat straw that the North Dakota Agricultural College has been able to carry on with these appropriations.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Then it is all over.

Mr. NORTON. I take it that it is not, but that they expect to improve on the best methods that have already been discovered.



The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For sugar-plant investigations, including studies of diseases and the improvement of the beet and beet seed, and methods of culture, and to determine for each sugar-beet area the agricultural operations required to insure a stable agriculture, \$64,115: *Provided*, That not less than \$10,000 of this sum shall be used for the development and improvement of American strains of sugar-beet seed and for the establishment of a permanent sugar-beet seed industry in the United States: *Provided further*, That this sum of \$12,500 may be used for investigations in connection with the production of cane and sorghum sirup, including the breeding, culture, and diseases of cane and sorghum, and the utilization of cane and sorghum by-products.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I believe it is generally understood that the Committee on Agriculture, which reports this bill, will soon be considering and will report to the House another price-fixing bill as a supplement to the law which was passed at the last session of Congress along the same line.

In connection with the consideration of this paragraph relating to sugar-plant investigations, it seems to me a proper time to call the attention of the committee to a situation which is liable to seriously affect next year's sugar supply of the country unless some action is immediately taken to remedy it. This is the time of year when the sugar-beet manufacturing companies contract with the farmers for their sugar-beet crop of next fall. The Food Administration has fixed the price of sugar. The sugar-beet companies claim that the price so fixed by the Food Administration does not enable them to pay a price which the farmers claim they must receive in order to make the raising of sugar beets profitable under the present abnormal conditions.

I am not familiar enough with the sugar-beet industry to tell which party to this controversy is correct, but I believe that the committee should carefully investigate it in preparing its next price-fixing bill. It certainly seems as though the consumer pays enough for his sugar now. At the same time the farmer with a good deal of justice complains that the price of the products of the farm is fixed, while no limit is put upon the price of those things which the farmer has to buy. He ought to receive a price for his sugar beets, which, taking all things into consideration, is a fair and reasonable one and which will encourage him to raise as large a crop as possible. Everything within reason should be done to enable him to raise them at a profit, or he will not raise them at all. If the sugar companies and the farmers can not agree upon the price the farmers will raise something else upon their farms and the sugar factories will be closed next fall. It necessarily follows that the sugar in the country will be much scarcer next year than it is this year even. I think it is only necessary to call the attention of the committee to the possibilities in this situation to show how important and serious a matter it may become. A deadlock between the farmers and the sugar-beet manufacturers can not be allowed under present world conditions. In the consideration of the next price-fixing bill I hope the committee will work out some plan which will enable the farmers to produce the maximum quantity of sugar beets and at a reasonable profit. If the chairman of the committee has any information that will throw light on the question now, I am sure the farmers in the sugar-beet localities will be glad to know what it is so that they can plan for the next crop accordingly. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in seven minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in seven minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] to say that he understood, or rather anticipated, that the Committee on Agriculture would soon bring in a bill fixing prices on a variety of products. My own hope is that the Agricultural Committee will consider any such proposition as that a long time, a very long time, give it a very good deal of consideration, and then forget about it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I should be glad to yield.

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman comes from an agricultural State and certainly is in sympathy with the position of the farmers that grow the sugar beets complaining that Congress has fixed the price of the products of the farm to a large extent but have not fixed the price of things that the farmers buy.

Mr. MONDELL. Congress, my friend will remember, has fixed the price of nothing. Congress has guaranteed that the farmer on next year's crop of wheat shall receive at the principal market

points at least \$2 a bushel. That is all Congress has done in the way of price fixing, and that is not a fixing but a minimum guaranty. The price may go much above \$2.

Mr. MAPES. Congress has enabled the Food Administration to fix the price of a great many products.

Mr. MONDELL. The Food Administration has in a way attempted to regulate certain prices, but the only price it has actually fixed is that of sugar at wholesale, and they have been enabled to do that because of the fact that sugar is produced by comparatively few concerns. The price, I am rather inclined to think, taking everything into consideration, was a fair one. I doubt if the farmers and beet-sugar manufacturers would have had any great difficulty in regard to fixing a price on sugar beets that would have been mutually satisfactory if certain busy-bodies had kept out of the affair and let the farmers and the beet-sugar manufacturers settle it between themselves. I am rather inclined to think now that a price may still be agreed upon which will be fairly satisfactory to both sides. Of course, it is true that with the high price of all agricultural products the growing of sugar beets, even at a maximum of nine or nine dollars and a half a ton, is not altogether attractive to the farmers in some sections, other farm products being so high. I am still of the opinion, however, that arrangements can be made, with sugar at approximately the present price, under which the farmers can get a price for beets that will encourage them to grow them.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and improvement of methods of crop production under subhumid, semiarid, or dry-land conditions, \$160,000: *Provided*, That the limitation in this act as to the cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in the free distribution, or propagation for free distribution, of cuttings, seedlings, or trees of willow, box elder, ash, caragana, or other common varieties of fruit, ornamental, or shelter-belt trees in the Northern Great Plains area, except for experimental or demonstration purposes in the States of North and South Dakota west of the one hundredth meridian, and in Montana and Wyoming east of the 5,000-foot contour line.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MONDELL: Page 25, lines 5 and 6, after the word "Wyoming," strike out the words "east of the 5,000-foot contour line" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in regions of less than 6,000 feet altitude."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, there are two objections to the language that now occurs in the bill. The first is that the territory is described as that east of the 5,000-foot contour line. There is a good bit of territory both in Wyoming and Montana that is less than 5,000 feet in altitude—that is, west of the mountain 5,000-foot contour line. Some of it lies in the interior valleys of the Rockies and some of it on the western side of the Continental Divide. The other objection is that the altitude limit is a little low. We can grow these trees at altitudes up to 6,000 feet, so that my amendment first raises the permissible altitude a thousand feet and changes the language so that it will apply to all parts of these States with lower altitudes. I trust there will be no objection on the part of the committee to the modification. We get very few of these trees, I will say, but it happens that last season when I wanted a few pennies' worth of the trees for an interior section of my State which is about 3,800 feet high, I could not, because the language of the bill prohibits it. It was not east of the 5,000-foot contour line.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have always thought that this appropriation ought not to be used for the production of shelter-belt trees for free distribution throughout any area. The department, however, has said that it is desirable to grow these shelter-belt trees at the Mandan station so that they might be used in a demonstrational way throughout the area described by this limitation. The tendency of the department, however, is to extend the work under this appropriation so as to make the station at Mandan nothing more or less than a free-tree distribution station. I do not think that that free distribution ought to be extended. The language in the bill is the language suggested by the department. The language describes the area in which this work can be properly carried on, and I should be very sorry to see it extended by the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Wyoming, much as I would like to see the gentleman from Wyoming accommodated in this or any other matter.

Mr. NORTON. The language is the same as we agreed on last year?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota, who is more familiar with this item than I am, because he was one of the parties to an agreement



that got the item in shape so that it could pass, and inasmuch as this has been sprung without the committee having any knowledge of the effect of the amendment, I feel that I should insist upon the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. In any event the committee wants the language to accurately state what the committee had in mind. The use of the word "east" does not accurately state it. What the committee intended was that these trees might be used in territory and regions below the 5,000-foot contour line. In other words, you have no objection to having these trees used in western Montana, though under the language of your bill they could be used only in eastern Montana below the 5,000-foot line and not in western Montana. If the word "east" is stricken out and the word "below" is inserted, the committee will accomplish just what it sought to accomplish.

Mr. LEVER. I confess to the gentleman that I do not recall just why the limitation "east" is used.

Mr. MONDELL. Undoubtedly that was adopted without thought of the fact that Montana and Wyoming both lie on the ridge of the continental divide and they have territory of comparatively low altitude on both sides, some of it on the west and some of it on the east. There is no more reason why you should give eastern Montana below 5,000 feet the trees than western Montana, and that is also true of Wyoming.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman would modify his amendment by striking out the word "east" and inserting the word "below"?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Is that all right?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not want it.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Minnesota wants to confine this distribution to eastern Montana and eastern Wyoming. That was not intended by any one. It was intended that these trees should not be distributed in high altitudes, and some of the lowest altitudes in Wyoming and Montana, both, are excluded from the benefits of this provision by the language as you have it there, because they are not east of the 5,000-foot contour line.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wyoming is entirely wrong in his interpretation of what was intended to be accomplished. What was intended is to fix a north and south line beyond which this distribution from the Mandan station should not extend. It was not a question of altitude at all. The 5,000-foot contour line was taken because that prevents a north and south line which could be utilized as a boundary beyond which the Mandan station would not undertake its free distribution of trees.

Mr. LEVER. I think, Mr. Chairman, without having fuller information about this, that I am justified in making the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The first part of this paragraph provides for the investigation and improvement of the methods of crop production under subhumid, semiarid, or dry-land conditions, \$160,000. No one appreciates more than I do the splendid work of the Agricultural Department. I think good work is done under nearly every item of this bill, and I regret that I feel it my duty to criticize the acts, the attitude, and the administration of those who expend these moneys. We have a great area in the West with little rainfall, a country that the hardy pioneer has been gradually winning from the desert, transforming from a cattle and sheep range into a cereal-growing, farming, dairy country. There are certain practices that must be followed, as has been demonstrated innumerable times by many people in widely separated sections of that region, in order to make farming in that section reasonably certain and profitable, and yet gentlemen in the Agricultural Department, having charge of these investigations and demonstrations, have for years and do now take the position that there is no such thing as reasonably insuring crop growth in those semiarid sections; that the best we can do is to just farm and take the chances, and if we get a crop, well and good, and if we do not get a crop that is the misfortune of the farmer. It is true—they have themselves proven on half a dozen demonstration farms—that the system of biennial crops, or the growing of two crops in three years, deep plowing, thorough cultivation, occasional or alternating summer fallow; summer cultivation not only greatly increases the production but renders farming in this section almost as certain as under an irrigation ditch, but after having demonstrated all this they discredit these thorough and scientific practices, these good farming practices, by saying that they do not pay. I am wondering when and where and

under what circumstances or conditions the Agricultural Department has ever demonstrated whether or not a certain practice is profitable. Under the conditions surrounding such experiments the best that can be demonstrated is the possibility of accomplishment. They may and continually do point out how a thing can be done, the methods necessary to accomplish it, but whether or no it will pay under ordinary or commercial conditions or the usual practice of the people is something that can only be demonstrated by the people themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask that I may have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Right now we are needing grain. The world is needing grain. This semiarid region, a considerable portion of it, is a fairly safe winter and spring wheat country, under good farming methods. A very much greater proportion of it is a perfectly safe barley and rye country. There are millions of acres that will produce rye, and rye is the grain which the people across the sea—our allies—many of them, have been accustomed to use, in the main, for bread for many years. There is an opportunity for encouraging increased development, increased production, but our friends in the Department of Agriculture, whom we pay to encourage agriculture in that section, after having demonstrated the possibility of carrying on agricultural operations with certainty, advise the farmer that it is doubtful as to whether it will pay to do it or not. We need new blood, new ideas, and new thoughts in the Agricultural Department in the matter of farming under semiarid conditions. We need people who will say to the farmers of that section: "You must farm thoroughly; you must farm carefully; you must farm scientifically; you must put into your work not only energy but care and thought; you must adopt the methods that will remove to a great extent the element of chance; and you will receive a goodly reward."

Instead of that, the views they promulgate encourage shiftlessness and thriftlessness, slipshod and careless methods and practices, by proclaiming that there is no plan or system that the farmer can afford to follow that will make his operations reasonably safe and secure—and yet our people are doing better every year, in spite of such teachings. You can not altogether prevent progress even by official error and misguidance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and improvement of fruits, and the methods of fruit growing, harvesting, and, in cooperation with the Bureau of Markets, studies of the behavior of fruits during the processes of marketing and while in commercial storage, \$85,280: *Provided*, That \$9,000 of said amount shall be available for the investigation and improvement of the pecan, and methods of growing, harvesting, packing, and shipping of same.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question.

I notice, on page 19, there is a provision of \$8,000 for the investigation of the diseases of the pecan. On page 25, just read, \$9,000 is made available for the investigation and improvement of the pecan. On page 55 \$9,600 is made available for the investigation of insects affecting the pecan. What is the difference between those three appropriations?

Mr. LEVER. The first item to which the gentleman refers is for the purpose of studying the diseases of the pecan. The item under consideration immediately is for the purpose of studying the handling and marketing of the pecan. The other item in the bill, in the Bureau of Entomology, is for the purpose of studying the insect pests which affect the pecan. All of these were put in the bill in the Senate last year, and the committee conferees, of course, agreed to them.

Mr. SNELL. What is the difference between investigating the diseases and the insects that affect them?

Mr. LEVER. There is a good deal of difference. The investigation of the diseases of the tree and the nut itself would be in the hands of men who are scientific along plant-disease lines. The investigation from the standpoint of the insect would be in the hands of an entomologist.

Mr. SNELL. It would not be proper, then, to put all three of these in one appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. It could be done. I thought of it at one time, but I did not see that it would be of any advantage, because we have three sets of specialists engaged in this work.

Mr. SNELL. Is the condition such as to warrant the appropriation of this amount for it at this time?



Mr. LEVER. The industry is spreading very rapidly throughout that area of the country in which the hickory-nut scaly bark will grow.

Mr. SNELL. To what part of the country is this industry confined?

Mr. LEVER. Practically throughout the South; but it will grow in this section of the country.

Mr. BLACK. I will just state for the gentleman's information that in my home county of Red River this year there have been marketed \$25,000 worth of pecans, whereas six or eight years ago it would not have amounted to over \$8,000 or \$8,000.

Mr. SNELL. I was wondering why it was put in three appropriations. Why should it not be carried in one lump sum? It seemed to me that they were all the same thing.

Mr. LEVER. It is for the reason that these three lines of scientists have grown up in the bureau.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of new and rare seeds; for the investigation and improvement of grasses, alfalfa, clover, and other forage crops, including the investigation of the utilization of cacti and other dry-land plants; and to conduct investigations to determine the most effective methods of eradicating weeds, \$143,180: *Provided*, That of this amount not to exceed \$60,000 may be used for the purchase and distribution of such new and rare seeds.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman withhold that a moment for me to offer an amendment to correct the text?

Mr. BLACK. I will.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 27, line 3, strike out the last "s" in the word "investigations."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLACK: Page 27, line 6, after the word "seeds," strike out the semicolon, insert a colon, and add the following:

"*Provided further*, That in the distribution of cotton seed under authority of this paragraph they shall be distributed in packages of not less than 1 peck to the package."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that, and I ask unanimous consent, before the gentleman proceeds, that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I will briefly explain the reason for the amendment which I have offered. The packages of cotton seed that are now distributed by the Department of Agriculture under authority of this paragraph contain a quart of seed. Now, usually it takes about 1 bushel of seed to plant an acre of cotton, and therefore you can see that the distribution that is now made by the department will only plant a very small part of an acre. The result is that, notwithstanding these seeds that are distributed are of improved variety, the quantity sent out is so small that very often it does not interest the farmer that receives them and the advantage of the distribution is lost. I am very heartily in favor of the distribution of these improved varieties of seed, but I think much better results can be accomplished by increasing the quantity sent to each one person.

Now, I presume that the only cotton-breeding station in the South is the one located in the section of Texas which I have the honor in part to represent. This station is located at Greenville and is under the supervision of one of the ablest and best informed men on agricultural subjects that I know, Dr. Saunders, and under his skill and knowledge there have been bred some very valuable improved varieties of cotton seed.

He has taken long-staple varieties and crossed them with what we call the big-boll early maturing varieties, and by that means he has developed the "Lone Star" and the "Hold On," the "Foster," and others, all of which have a strong fiber and a longer staple than the short-staple varieties and are nearly as quick in their maturing. Now, as I said awhile ago, the package sent out is a fine quality of seed, but is such a small quantity that it very often does not interest the farmer who receives it, and I think if the quantity was increased to packages of not less than a peck a great deal better results would be obtained. I am anxious to promote the success of this enterprise of interesting our farmers in these improved seeds, and that is why I have offered the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. LEVER.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit, I think practically every member of the Committee on Agriculture from cotton-growing States agrees with the gentleman on this proposition; but not being able to examine carefully just how far the gentleman's amendment goes, I thought I ought to reserve a point of order. I may say, further, that we called the attention of the chief of the bureau in charge of the work to the fact that we did not think they were getting very good results from their quart-measure distribution. I am inclined to think that matter will be remedied without legislation.

Mr. BLACK. If that is so, of course there would be no special need for my amendment. But I fear that under the present system a great deal of the seed is being wasted.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I agree with you. I think the amendment will have a very salutary effect in bringing the department to realize the situation.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman's amendment contemplate an increase in the amount?

Mr. BLACK. Not at all, in the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. WALSH. Then if your amendment is adopted it would result in fewer people getting the seed?

Mr. BLACK. Yes. The point I make is that the money we do spend ought to be spent in a way certain to bring results. I know from my knowledge and experience of farming that these quantities are so small that a great many planters just discard them and throw them away and do not pay any attention to them.

Mr. FOSTER. The difficulty is not in planting but in saving the seed?

Mr. BLACK. Yes. They need a larger quantity.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Yes. I have had a similar experience. One of my constituents, to whom I had sent some of this seed, said to me, "Zeek, there were so few of them that I did not think I could get any results from them, and I cast them aside."

Mr. BLACK. Yes; I wish the gentleman would withdraw his point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Well, this is a matter of importance, and I am satisfied that we can remedy the situation without legislation.

Mr. BLACK. Of course, I am glad to receive that assurance from the chairman. I hope he will interest himself in the subject as he always does in matters affecting agriculture and the welfare of our farmers.

Mr. LEVER. I will. I am glad the gentleman called my attention to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of making an inquiry of the gentleman from South Carolina concerning the item beginning on line 3 of page 26. My attention was diverted at the moment when that item was read, otherwise I would have called attention to it then. The item pertains to horticultural investigations. In it is a peculiar phrase—"study of the behavior of vegetables while in the process of marketing and in commercial storage." Does the gentleman wish to hold to that language? [Laughter.]

Mr. LEVER. It is peculiar language. I realize that fact. It was submitted by the department, however. It means, when translated into the language of Congress, what changes take place in these various vegetables.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If these words regarding "behavior" were stricken out would it lessen the effect of the paragraph? The language is, "studies of the behavior of vegetables." It seems to me that such a peculiar phrase ought to go out.

Mr. LEVER. I am a little afraid it would make a difference. Under this item in past years we have not only studied what takes place within the vegetable while it is in process of shipment but we have also studied the marketing conditions of the vegetables. We have transferred those to the Division of Markets, and we want to use this language so that we will not study the market features of the vegetables, but only the vegetables themselves while they are being marketed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If left as it is the "behavior" of the potato might mean acrobatic behavior or good or bad behavior. Or it might refer to the sprouting of potatoes, or something of that kind. If that is what it means it seems to



me the effect would be the same if you struck out the word "behavior." "Studies" of vegetables while they are being transported would seem to be sufficiently comprehensive.

Mr. LEVER. They use that language to make clear to Congress the discrimination between the studies conducted under this item and those conducted under the item for the Bureau of Markets. I think we had better leave these words in the bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Does not the gentleman think we have done a pretty good day's work?

Mr. LEVER. I am going to ask the Clerk to read the general administrative item of seed distribution, and then I will move to rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds: For purchase, propagation, testing, and congressional distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants; all necessary office fixtures and supplies, fuel, transportation, paper, twine, gum, postal cards, gas, electric current, rent outside of the District of Columbia, official traveling expenses, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same; for repairs and the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$242,320. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned, and in which same are to be distributed as hereinafter stated, and such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, after due advertisement and on competitive bids, is authorized to award the contract for the supplying of printed packets and envelopes and the packing, assembling, and mailing of the seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, or any part thereof, for a period of not more than five years nor less than one year, if by such action he can best protect the interests of the United States. An equal proportion of five-sixths of all seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants shall upon their request, after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents, or mailed by the department upon the receipt of their addressed franks, in packages of such weight as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Postmaster General may jointly determine: *Provided, however*, That upon each envelope or wrapper containing packages of seeds the contents thereof shall be plainly indicated, and the Secretary shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each Member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents: *Provided also*, That the seeds allotted to Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-fourth parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery not later than the 10th day of January: *Provided also*, That any portion of the allotments to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress remaining uncalled for on the 1st day of April shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture, giving preference to those persons whose names and addresses have been furnished by Senators and Representatives in Congress and who have not before during the same season been supplied by the department: *And provided also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased and the date of purchase; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same. And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, mulberry and other rare and valuable trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to correct a typographical error.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman will be read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 30, line 2, after the word "cuttings" insert a comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: Page 27, line 24, strike out the figures "\$242,320" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$363,480."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we can not arrange to close debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto. As far as I am personally concerned I do not desire any time, and I would like to test out the committee to see just how much time is needed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not see how we can agree on closing the debate to-night. I think I am the only member of the committee on this side who is still present. There are only a very few here, and I would not feel that I was doing justice to my colleagues on this side if I undertook to make an agreement or permitted an agreement to be made.

Mr. LEVER. In view of the gentleman's statement I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRISP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the Agricultural appropriation bill, H. R. 9054, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### THE VIRGIN ISLANDS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

ST. THOMAS, VIRGIN ISLANDS,  
January 17, 1918.

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington:

The executive committee in charge of celebrations commemorating this day on behalf of those accepting citizenship in the United States solemnly pledge their loyalty to the United States; being fully conscious of and duly appreciating the great benefits of American citizenship, beg to assure the Government of their true and faithful allegiance.

BALDEMAR MILLER, Chairman.

The SPEAKER. This communication will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY, FEBRUARY 12.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on February 12, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to speak for 45 minutes on the life and character of Lincoln.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] got 30 minutes in which to make a speech, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] got time to read Lincoln's Gettysburg speech, so that the gentleman's request comes in after that of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONDON. I ask unanimous consent that following the gentleman from Kentucky I may address the House for 15 minutes on Lincoln as a world force.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the speech of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] on Lincoln's birthday he be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on Lincoln as a world force. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FLOOD, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported a bill (H. R. 9314) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report (H. Rept. No. 271), ordered to be printed.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio reserves all points of order.

#### EIGHT-HOUR STANDARD WORKDAY FOR RAILROAD EMPLOYEES (H. DOC. NO. 690).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, ordered printed, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In compliance with the provision of section 2 of the act of Congress approved September 3 and September 5, 1916, to establish an eight-hour day for employees of carriers engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, I transmit herewith the report of the commission appointed to observe the operation and effects of the institution of the eight-hour standard workday for railroad employees.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, 28 January, 1918.

#### LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 29, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.



### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 357) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, consider, and determine certain claims of the Cherokee Nation against the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 266), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DILL, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 2493) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes," approved December 29, 1916, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 267), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5673) to extend payment to the homesteaders on the south half of the Colville Reservation, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 268), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. TILLMAN, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 855) for the relief of Harriet Fisher, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 269), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RAKER, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1423) for the relief of Alexander F. McCollam, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 270), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 1919) granting a pension to Harry N. Gates; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 2863) granting a pension to John Ferriter; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 8300) granting an increase of pension to George Perkins; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 9084) granting a pension to Harry N. Gates; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 9311) for the reorganization of the Medical Department of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 9312) to amend section 5 of the motor-boat law passed June 9, 1910; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 9313) to reimburse the State of Minnesota for expenses incurred in mobilizing its National Guard pursuant to the calls of the President during the years 1916 and 1917; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 9314) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution (H. Res. 237) authorizing the President and Attorney General of the United States to issue orders to corporations and individuals concerning control of cold-storage and other large supplies of food and fuel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9315) granting an increase of pension to Henry Athey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEAKES: A bill (H. R. 9316) for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under joint resolution of July 14, 1870, authorizing the Postmaster General to continue in use in the Postal Service Marcus P. Norton's combined postmarking and stamp-canceling hand stamp patents, or otherwise; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 9317) granting an increase of pension to Hezekiah Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9318) for the relief of Susanah Nuce; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 9319) granting a pension to William F. Conklin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 9320) granting a pension to Mrs. Albert J. Wolff; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 9321) granting a pension to Joseph Donnelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9322) granting a pension to Emma R. Steen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 9323) granting a pension to Lusina Clouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 9324) granting a pension to Thomas W. Trent; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9325) granting an increase of pension to Mary Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 9326) granting an increase of pension to Henry Page; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 9327) granting a pension to Louis A. Rowe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9328) granting a pension to James Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9329) granting an increase of pension to Albert McMichaels; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9330) for the relief of Sylvester Haus; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9331) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 9332) granting an increase of pension to George W. Griffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 9333) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Hathaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: A bill (H. R. 9334) granting a pension to Christine Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 9335) granting an increase of pension to Archie V. Chambers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 9336) granting an increase of pension to James M. Perry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9337) granting an increase of pension to Alfred McFeely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 9338) granting an increase of pension to Guilford D. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9339) granting a pension to Robert E. McCormick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 9340) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Tredway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 9341) granting an increase of pension to Jesse C. Eldridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 9342) granting a pension to Charles H. Carey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 9343) for the relief of Herbert R. Cornforth; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 9344) granting an increase of pension to James K. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9345) granting a pension to Nancy C. Saylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 9346) granting a pension to Alfred Cushman; to the Committee on Pensions.



By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 9347) authorizing the appointment of Brig. Gen. John H. Patterson, United States Army, retired, as a major general on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 9348) for the relief of J. H. Livingston; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 9349) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to John Zimmerman for certain lands in the Colorado National Forest upon the surrender of other lands of an equal acreage also located in the Colorado National Forest, Colo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 9350) granting an increase of pension to Robert McMartin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 9351) granting a pension to Thomas J. Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.,

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolution of the Missouri Live-Stock Producers' Association, asking that the rural-credit law be strengthened, and asking the Food Administration to state whether the ratio of 13 to 1 would be maintained in the purchase of spring farrows, or whether the price of corn would be arbitrarily fixed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Lady of the Lake Lodge, No. 512, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Toledo, Ohio, urging increase in salaries particularly to those employed by the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry rural carriers of the ninth congressional district of Missouri, asking maintenance and equipment allowance for extra mileage and additional pay for pouch mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution of the board of governors of the International Allied Printing Trades Association (approved by the tenth annual convention of the union label trades department of the American Federation of Labor), protesting against the zone system as applied to second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Asbury Park Chamber of Commerce, of Asbury Park, N. J., recommending the abandonment of the zone plan for second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania: Petition of 43 employees of the Trask, Prescott & Richardson department store, of Erie, Pa., praying for the passage of House bill 7995, for the preservation of the *Niagara*, Commodore Perry's flagship in the Battle of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of W. S. McCrea, Spokane, Wash., favoring S. 313, providing for an absolute long-and-short-haul law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Colgate & Co., New York, N. Y., urging the passage of the Calder daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the Board of Governors of the International Allied Printing Trades Association, of the New York Business Publishers' Association, and of the Asbury Park Chamber of Commerce, Asbury Park, N. J., protesting against the provisions of the revenue act concerning second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a letter from the Pineoleum Co., New York City, favoring the provisions of the revenue act dealing with second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of the Board of Governors of the International Allied Printing Trades Association urging the repeal of the zonal system for second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Memorial of New York Business Publishers' Association, favoring repeal of the zone system for second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of the Irish Women's Council, appealing for the recognition of Ireland as the Irish Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY of Alabama: Petitions of Louis Long, R. F. D. No. 1, Irvington, Ala.; Rudolph B. Cox, R. F. D. No. 1, Coffeeville, Ala.; G. L. Shreve, R. F. D. No. 1, Chrichton, Ala.; and G. W. Riley, R. F. D. No. 1, Jeddo, Ala., urging an increase in the salaries of rural free-delivery mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a petition of Earl C. Garrison, H. L. McElroy, Thomas J. Robinson, David E. Wilson, Seaborn L. Bonner, and Wilton

P. Woolf, rural letter carriers of Choctaw County, Ala., urging an increase of salaries, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 8585, granting a pension to Eugene V. Wagner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: Petition of 46 rural carriers, urging the passage of a bill providing a maintenance and equipment allowance, additional pay for mileage in excess of 24 miles, and an allowance for those carriers who must carry pouch mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Resolution of knitting manufacturers of Philadelphia, of the National Association of Hosiery and Underwear Manufacturers, protesting against the action of the Fuel Administrator in closing industrial plants; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PLATT: Petition of citizens of Newburgh, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 7995 for the preservation of the *Niagara*, Commodore Perry's flagship in the Battle of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PRATT: Petitions of sundry rural mail carriers of the Thirty-seventh New York congressional district, favoring adequate compensation for their services; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of rural-route carriers of the twentieth district of Illinois for a larger allowance; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. REED: Evidence in support of House bill 9303, granting an increase of pension to Joseph Crites; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANFORD: Papers to accompany House bill 9143, granting a pension to Henrietta De Groat; also, papers to accompany House bill 9139, granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Trimble; and also, papers to accompany House bill 9141, granting a pension to Rosella Magee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9145, for the relief of John J. Dooley; also, papers to accompany House bill 9148, for the relief of Martin W. Joraleman, alias Whitbeck; also, papers to accompany House bill 9147, for the relief of Henry C. Romaine; also, papers to accompany House bill 9146, for the relief of Ferris W. Wade; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 29, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hearest the prayers of those who seek Thee in faith and confidence, hasten the day, we beseech Thee, when pure and undefiled religion shall be spread abroad in all the earth; when men of all nations and of all climes shall look up to Thee in faith and call Thee Father; that by the strong ties of brotherhood men shall, indeed, fulfill the prophecy of old and beat their swords into plowshares, their spears into pruning hooks, and learn war no more.

So may Thy Kingdom come and Thy will be done in all the world, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MAIL TO EXPEDITIONARY FORCES.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker. I call up a privileged resolution, H. Res. 232, and move to discharge the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads from further consideration of the same and that the same be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House resolution 232.

*Resolved*, That the Postmaster General be requested to inform this House upon the following:

First. What is the length of time now required to transmit postal matter from the United States to members of the American Expeditionary Force in France, and from members of the American Expeditionary Force in France to the destination of such postal matter within the United States.

Second. Whether he or any other person or persons or committee or committees or commission or commissions appointed by him have investigated or are now investigating the subject in order to ascertain whether the time now consumed in transit can be curtailed, and losses, if any, of mail matter be reduced.

Third. Whether he or such other person or persons or committee or committees or commission or commissions have reported.

Fourth. What were the findings and recommendations, if any, contained in such report.

Fifth. And what, if any, steps he has taken to curtail the time of such postal matter in transit and reduce the losses thereof, if any.